

THE ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR MARCH, 1832.

Art. I. *The Works of the Rev. Robert Hall, A.M.* With a brief Memoir and a Sketch of his Literary Character, by the Right Hon. Sir J. Mackintosh, LL.D. M.P. And a Sketch of his Character as a Theologian and a Preacher, by the Rev. John Foster. Published under the Superintendence of Olinthus Gregory, LL.D. F.R.A.S. Professor of Mathematics in the Royal Military Academy. In six Volumes, 8vo. Price £3. 12s. Royal Paper, £6. London, 1831, 1832.

AS five volumes of this most interesting and valuable publication are now before the public, one of them entirely composed of matter previously unpublished, our readers will, perhaps, deem us culpable, if we should any longer delay to devote an article to these volumes: to do justice to their contents would, indeed, require a series of papers. We will confess, however, that we enter upon the task with the reluctance inspired by timidity, and by the consciousness that it demands an abler hand. To borrow the elegant apology of Howe, in his oration on the death of Dr. Bates, 'To give the just praises of Cicero, *Cicerone laudatore opus fuerit*, there were need of Cicero himself to be the encomiast.' We will not add, 'There is no man left to do it suitably for him.' Happily, there are survivors whose powers of mind and force of eloquence, added to their personal acquaintance with Mr. Hall, and their just appreciation of his talents and character, fully and remarkably qualify them for the service they have respectively undertaken. Ample justice will be done to the subject, and a worthy tribute of honour be paid to the memory of their distinguished friend. But this very circumstance renders our position the more embarrassing. If it does not supersede the necessity of a critical notice of these volumes, it seems to render it becoming, that we should wait to hear the estimate pronounced

upon them, and upon the literary character of their Author, by judges whose opinions is authority, and whose encomium is fame. Had not Mr. Foster's pen been so much better engaged, we should, indeed, have claimed at his hands the discharge of the duty which now devolves upon the present Contributor. We could have wished to be gratified with a perusal of his 'Sketch,' before venturing any remarks of our own. But, as the last volume is not at present forthcoming, we must run all hazards, and attempt at least a general review of the works before us; reserving for a future article, a biographical estimate of our revered and admirable friend, when we shall have before us, the Memoir and the Sketches of Character which are to appear in the concluding volume.

When we first saw the Works of Robert Hall announced for publication in six volumes, and found that four of the six would be occupied almost entirely with the reprint of what had appeared during his life-time, we were at some loss to conceive of what they would consist. It had always been a standing matter of regret, that Mr. Hall wrote so little. For many years he had been solicited—till the urgent solicitation became to him an unspeakable annoyance—to put forth a volume of sermons. The mechanical labour of writing was extremely irksome and painful to him; and the difficulty he found in satisfying himself in his compositions, increased his disinclination to comply with the requisitions of his friends. The only production of his pen which attained the magnitude of a boarded volume, was his Reply to Mr. Kinghorn, in which an intense interest in the subject, and in the great principles the discussion involved, supplied a stimulus sufficiently powerful to overcome at once the fatigue of composition and the distaste for controversy. Now, however, that all his sermons and tracts come to be collected, it is seen that Mr. Hall's avowed publications were far more numerous and considerable than was generally supposed, and that one reason of his being thought to write so little, was that he wrote so well. This was not the only reason of the incorrect impression. A volume discharged at once from the press, makes an impression upon the imagination of the public, more distinct and lasting than a long series of smaller publications put forth unobtrusively at uncertain intervals. Nor is this all. Mr. Hall, unquestionably, surpassed, in his living oratory, the finest of his written compositions. One of the most splendid and most impressive of his productions, the Sermon on 'the Discouragements and Supports of the Christian Minister', originally delivered as a charge at the ordination of his friend Mr. Robertson, we have been assured by competent judges who heard it, falls far short, in its printed form, of the sublime eloquence of the Preacher. Nor is this opinion attributable to any illusion pro-

duced by the voice and gesture of the orator; for, although Mr. Hall's manner was rendered commanding and impressive in no ordinary degree, by the intellectual glory which he would appear to catch from his topic, reflected on his countenance, still, his thoughts and words, when literally preserved, were found scarcely to lose any thing upon being submitted to analysis. They were not like flints glistening in the sunshine, but real ore. That the printed sermon would be inferior to the one delivered, is therefore entirely credible, and admits of an explanation that may preclude all astonishment at the fact. Although no Christian teacher of the humblest order of talent ever more honestly devoted the best faculties and resources of his mind to the preparation of his sermons, than Mr. Hall did,—always, till in his latter years, writing more or less of what he intended to preach,—he was nevertheless, in the proper sense, an extemporaneous preacher. We are not aware whether or not, in early life, he made use of notes in the pulpit. If he did, he laid the practice aside, trusting to his memory the retention of the firmly knit chain of thought, but not taxing his recollection for premeditated modes of expression, which no speaker is at a loss for, who has the proper command of his ideas*. We have heard Mr. Hall remark, that he considered those as generally his best sermons, of which he wrote the most; but then he never attempted to commit to memory what he had written, his object being to prosecute and arrange his thoughts, not to elaborate his periods. And what he the most carefully composed, was the exordium of his discourses and the argumentative portion, in which he seldom affected any thing beyond a lucid perspicuity of statement, generally commencing with a brief exposition of his text, or a simple enuncia-

* Since penning the above, our eye has been caught by a 'Note by the Editor', in reference to Mr. Hall's method of preaching, inserted at p. 9 of the first volume of the Works; from which we take the following extract. 'Nothing can be more erroneous than the idea, entertained by a few persons, that Mr. Hall recited his sermons *memoriter*, from the study of a previously written composition. His eloquence was the spontaneous result of his vigorous and richly stored intellect. His usual course was, very briefly to sketch the plan of the proposed discourse, marking the divisions, specifying a few texts, and sometimes writing the first sentence. This he regarded as "digging a channel for his thoughts to flow in". Then, calling into exercise the power of abstraction, which he possessed in a degree I never saw equalled, he would, whether alone or not, pursue his trains of thought, retrace and extend them, until the whole were engraven on his mind; and when once so fixed in their entire connexion, they were never after obliterated. The most striking and impressive passages were often, strictly speaking, extemporaneous.'

tion of the leading propositions of his subject. The portions of his discourses which were always the most eloquent, consisted of the practical inferences, the moral application of his topic, or the concluding reflections. These touching and powerful appeals to the affections and conscience, as will be seen from the specimens in the fifth volume, were often, if not always, indicated only by heads in the prepared outline, and filled up *ad libitum* under the genuine excitement of the occasion, the excitement produced by the theme itself. It was in these parts of his pulpit addresses, after he had completed the ground-work of his argument, and discharged his memory of all that had been entrusted to it, that his utterance would become more rapid, and more clear and flowing in proportion to its rapidity, that his diction too seemed to catch a glow from the accelerated velocity of his ideas, and that he would throw out those flashes of expression, apparently generated by the spontaneous combustion of his thoughts, which startled or delighted his hearers, like the sudden illumination of the sky by a meteor. These fugitive corruscations of eloquence, it was next to impossible for the most accurate recollection distinctly to preserve, or for the most accomplished stenographer to transfer to his tablets. No previous elaboration could have produced such genuine bursts of felicitous oratory, nor any inferior theme have inspired them, than the realities connected with Eternity.

It is not very surprising, then, that Mr. Hall's writings should have been thrown into the back-ground by the greater prominence and more indisputable pre-eminence which attached to him as a pulpit orator; and that publications which would have been deemed amply sufficient to confer on an unknown author a brilliant celebrity, and numerous enough to entitle an ordinary one to the merit of a prolific industry, should scarcely have added very sensibly to Mr. Hall's fame, or have satisfied in any measure the craving expectations of the religious public. One only of his printed sermons may be regarded as an exception; for that sermon, the most carefully composed, the most elaborately finished, and the most magnificent, perhaps, of all his published writings, not even excepting the Sermon on Modern Infidelity, certainly extended, and, had he left nothing else, would have justified to posterity his fame as a preacher. We refer to the Sermon on the Death of the Princess Charlotte, which its Author is reported to have himself regarded as his *chef d'œuvre*, and in which he may fairly be considered as having surpassed the finest effusions of Bossuet, of whom, in that discourse more especially, he reminds us. The extraordinary sale of that discourse may be ascribed in some measure to the engrossing popular interest which the occasion awakened, and to the attractions which even a sermon borrowed from the name of the Princess over whose grave it was

pronounced. But, of the numerous instructive and eloquent sermons preached and issued from the press on that historic occasion, one only continues to be read, and will be read so long as the English language is spoken.

The name of Mr. Hall secured a rapid and continued sale for every publication on which it appeared; nor was it ever discredited. Our deliberate opinion is, nevertheless, that, as a writer, Mr. Hall was under-rated, rather than fully appreciated; partly from the comparison which his hearers were apt to draw between the effect of his oratory and that of his compositions on their own feelings, and partly from the distinguishing characteristics of Mr. Hall's writings. We do not feel sure that a volume of sermons from his pen would have fully answered the expectations of his admirers. The fervour of the preacher would have seemed to have subsided to a lower temperature; and Mr. Hall's severely fastidious taste would have led him, probably, to exclude or to modify some of those bold, and vehement, and lofty bursts of expression into which, in the pulpit, he was apt to be transported. The qualities of his discourses and of his written composition, upon which he would have been disposed to pride himself, had he indulged in the pettiness of vanity, would have been, we suspect, very different from those which constituted the popular charm, and left the strongest impression upon the memory. No man ever said finer things, either in the pulpit or out of it, than Mr. Hall; but he was not a sayer of fine things. The most striking were generally unpremeditated; in proof of which it needs only be remarked, that he was peculiarly happy in repartee. In his preaching, he often struck out golden sentences, of unimprovable felicity, and rich with thought; and those of his hearers who were lying in wait for these, would seldom be disappointed. But Mr. Hall would not have repeated, or defended, all the expressions which were admired for their strength; much less would he deliberately have printed them. They frequently passed away from his own memory; and on one occasion, when an accomplished friend, a member of his church at Leicester, was reading to him, at his own request, some notes she had ventured to take of his discourses, he interrupted her with—'Did I say that, Madam? I did not know I had ever said any thing so fine.' Now the expression which pleased him so much, exceedingly striking as it was, would have passed over many an ear, as containing nothing very remarkable, on account of its beautiful simplicity. We will venture to say, that by nothing would Mr. Hall's *prepared* expressions, his premeditated phraseology in the pulpit, have been more broadly marked, than by a chaste propriety, a lucid perspicuity, and a terseness at the furthest remove from exaggeration or extravagance. The prevailing style of modern composition was to him so offensive, that, as he once

expressed it, he found Addison's writings useful as a sponge to wipe the trash out of his memory. His own style is as purely English as Addison's, without its occasional inaccuracy and pervading feebleness; as energetic as Warburton's, without his coarseness; and we may add, as classical as Burke's, without his pomp and artificialness. To a certain extent, his *prepared* diction in the pulpit and in his published writings was, no doubt, much the same,—alike chaste, simple, and elegant; but, as we have already remarked, his choice of words, in the delivery of his discourses, was, for the most part, extemporaneous, and therefore better adapted, probably, than any premeditated forms of expression could have been, to the purpose and occasion.

But the intellectual grandeur of Mr. Hall's conceptions, which often led him to complain of the inadequacy of language as the medium of expression, disdained the cheap artifices of new-coined words, intensitives, and what may be called the gesticulation of phraseology. He extremely disliked the mere vehemence of words, and abhorred with all his soul, every thing that partook of meretricious display, more especially in the pulpit.

‘ Simple, grave, sincere ;
In doctrine incorrupt ; in language plain,
And plain in manner ; decent, solemn, chaste,
And natural in gesture ; much impressed
Himself, as conscious of his awful charge,
And anxious mainly that the flock he feeds
May feel it too ; affectionate in look,
And tender in address, as well becomes
A messenger of grace to guilty men.
Behold the picture !—Is it like ? ’ *

We may leave all who ever heard Mr. Hall, to supply the answer to the Poet's question. In these respects, he was a model, but a model chiefly because his manner was the result of nothing but the simplicity of his feelings and the calm self-possession of his thoughts.

The essential merit of Mr. Hall's discourses, and that which he would, we are persuaded, have regarded as such, lay in their construction, not in their embellishment; in the philosophical groundwork of thought which determines the form, and constitutes the strength of the whole superstructure, without meeting the eye of a common observer. Mr. Hall's forte was reasoning. His rhetoric was always based upon true logic. While he derided what is called metaphysics, and scarcely ever used an expression that savoured of the schools, the mould of his thoughts was strictly

* Cowper's ‘Time Piece.’

metaphysical. His imagination was metaphysical, rather than poetic; and his reasoning, while always popular in its terms, was always philosophical in texture. This was, of course, not perceptible by the majority of his hearers, nor did it ever obtrude itself upon the attention. He would have regarded a display of philosophy in the pulpit, as not less unbecoming and reprehensible than a display of oratory. The subjects which he usually chose, were familiar and practical, adapted for general usefulness. Those in which he delighted were, indeed, of a higher order; and when the subject demanded to be treated philosophically, the Preacher was in his element. Yet, so improper did he deem it, to indulge himself in a style of preaching above the level of an ordinary audience, that when he had been induced, at the pressing solicitation of a friend whom he highly esteemed, to repeat, on a particular occasion, a discourse of this character, he afterwards expressed contrition at having done wrong in complying. Of the discourse to which we refer, an imperfect but most interesting and valuable outline has been preserved, which appears in the fifth volume; and we shall interrupt the thread of our remarks, for the sake of introducing a few paragraphs, in exemplification of the elevated style of thought which was the most congenial to Mr. Hall's mind.

The text of the discourse is 2 Pet. iii. 8. "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years." The general sentiment founded upon it is, that the Eternity of God affords a sufficient explanation of the apparent delay in the accomplishment of the Divine purposes. The exordium, as usual with the Preacher, is a brief exposition of the context; and nothing can be more simple than the plan of the discourse. It is proposed, first, to illustrate the import of the words, and to establish the truth of the proposition they contain: secondly, to shew to what particular uses the truth which they exhibit may be applied. The import of the words being simply and familiarly explained, the argument in support of the truth of the proposition proceeds as follows.

1. Every portion of duration is something real, and has a true and proper existence; but the epithets great and small, when applied to this, (as well as to any thing else,) are merely comparative. They necessarily imply a comparison of one quantity with another, without which they can never be applied with justice; for what is great, compared with one quantity, becomes, at the same moment, little when compared with another, and *vice versâ*. Thus, fourscore years are, at present, considered as a great age, but would not have been called so before the Deluge. That age is now styled great with propriety, because it is so compared with the usual term of life, which is considerably less. And, for an opposite reason, it would, before the Flood, have been styled small, because it would have been so, compared with the average term of human life at that period, which was much

greater. We should consider fifty years as forming a very large portion of human life: but the same number of years in the history of an empire, would be justly considered small. Thus is the same quantity either great or small, as you place it by the side of something much inferior to it in magnitude, or much superior.

‘ 2. Hence it results, that *absolute greatness belongs only to what is infinite*; for, whatever falls short of this, however great it may appear, its supposed greatness is entirely owing to the incidental absence of another object that is greater. It may be, it will be, infallibly reduced to insignificance, the moment it comes into comparison with that which is so prodigiously superior to it.

‘ 3. *In duration, absolute greatness belongs only to eternity*. The epithet great, or whatever other is most expressive of the profoundest astonishment, is, with the utmost propriety, applied to that unfathomable abyss. Incapable of being placed in any light, or brought, even by imagination, into any comparison which should reduce it to insignificance, it asserts its pre-eminence, and vindicates its majesty, in all places and times, in all the possible varieties of being, or combinations of thought.

‘ 4. We must then conceive, that He who has subsisted throughout eternal ages, who knows no beginning of days nor end of years, who *possesses eternity*;—to whom all its parts (if we may be allowed so to speak) are continually open, both past and future; must have a very different apprehension of that inconsiderable portion of it we call time, from creatures who are acquainted with no other. His apprehension, we may easily conceive, will be, in this respect, very different; and that what to us appears a large portion, will, in his eyes, appear very inconsiderable.

‘ Nor let any one here object, and say, it must appear as it is, and therefore, there is no reason to suppose it appears to him different from what it does to us. No doubt it appears to him exactly as it is. His apprehensions are, unquestionably, agreeable to the nature of things. But it does not follow from thence, that it must appear in the same light [to Him] as it does to us. And if there may be a difference, it is surely the highest presumption to make ourselves the standard.

‘ That each portion of duration appears to him real, we admit: we are not contending for its being annihilated in his view. Something it is, and something it appears, unquestionably, in his eyes who views things as they are. But this is far from proving that a limited portion of duration must appear to him of the same precise magnitude that it does in our eyes.

‘ We know, by experience, how susceptible we are of a diversity of apprehension in this respect; and that at some periods, and in some situations, the same portion of time appears much longer than at others. In circumstances of extreme misery, the moments seem to linger, and the lapse of time is slow. How long would a few minutes appear, passed in excruciating torment! In a season of anxious expectation, which has a portion of misery in it, the same effect is experienced in a lower degree. On the contrary, in a state of enjoyment, the hours seem to take wings, and we are but little sensible of the progress of time. When the mind is fully engaged on a delightful

subject, when the attention is deeply absorbed in a pleasing train of reflection, we become scarcely conscious that any space of time has elapsed. We must infer from hence, that perfect happiness diminishes inconceivably the impression of time; as, on the contrary, intense misery increases it.

‘ Among all the conceptions we form of the Supreme Being, there is none the propriety of which we can less doubt, than of his perfect happiness; nor have any who have believed on him failed to ascribe to him this perfection in the highest possible degree. He is styled, in scripture, “the blessed and only Potentate,” the happy God. And as he is the fountain of all happiness to his creatures, it resides in him as in its utmost plenitude,—as in its proper seat. If his gracious presence is such a perpetual spring of felicity; if it is at “his right hand there are pleasures for evermore”; how much must he enjoy every moment in the contemplation of his perfections, in the survey of his works and designs, and in the possession of his consciousness of his supreme dominion and transcendent excellence, his unutterable and unbounded felicity!

‘ Conceive, then, of a Being absolutely independent, and existing from eternity; in the enjoyment of infinite happiness, always master of his purpose, never perplexed with difficulty, never agitated with anxious expectation, resting on his own all-sufficiency, and viewing with complacency each attribute of his infinite fulness. What, then, is an age in his view, compared to what it is in the eyes of mortals? Surely, with such a Being, “one day *must* be as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.”

‘ Admiration is, in most instances, the offspring of ignorance; at least, it implies a limitation of the views: so that an object shall appear great in the contemplation of one man, which, to another of more elevated and capacious powers, shall appear small and inconsiderable. But, to an infinite understanding, nothing can appear great, that does not partake of its own infinity. The Supreme Mind, and that alone, grasps eternity, possesses it every moment. *He not only comprehends, but constitutes, eternal duration*; by enduring “from everlasting to everlasting.” For there could be no eternal duration, if something did not always endure: we cannot conceive of its existence but as a mode of being, and that being is God.

‘ The measure by which he estimates time is, consequently, quite different from that which we are compelled to apply, in its contemplation. We measure one portion of duration by another: He measures time by eternity. How inconceivably different must be the apprehension arising from these different methods of considering it! In attempting to form a conception of endless duration, we are under the necessity of accumulating ages upon ages, and multiplying millions of ages into millions; accompanied with this conviction, that we have arrived no nearer to an adequate comprehension of it; that there remains beyond us an infinitely larger space than we have travelled over. To his view, it is every moment present; to him, it is familiar, as his element, his habitation; and, from that stupendous elevation, he looks down upon the scenes of time and the lapse of ages. These reflections

may assist us to conceive, how to him one day must necessarily be "as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."

Vol. V. pp. 373—378.

The notes of the second part of the discourse are very brief. In illustration of the use to which the doctrine of the text may be applied, it is observed, that, 1. 'it removes the ground of objection against the fulfilment of the Divine declarations, arising 'from the accomplishment being long delayed'; (this position is supported by a few considerations;) and, 2dly, 'it accounts for 'the peculiar cast of Scripture language, when employed in announcing the coming of Christ and the end of all things.' The concluding reflection is quite characteristic, in its turn of thought, of Mr. Hall's original, yet simple manner of enforcing practical truths.

'3. Though we cannot immediately change our senses, let us endeavour to conform our ideas and convictions to the dictates of Infalible Wisdom on this subject. Let us consider the whole duration of things here as very short.'

We were not fortunate enough to hear this discourse; but we could not have mistaken the authorship. How, in the Preacher's hands, the compact series of sublime argument would have expanded itself in the illustration, so as to accumulate strength, while it acquired greater distinctness, and more vividly presented itself to the understanding in its full import, those who have had the privilege of hearing Mr. Hall, can well imagine. And they may conceive also of the forceful eloquence with which, having made good his argumentative position, he would, as it were, open a battery upon the consciences of his hearers, in the practical remarks that came warm from his own excited feelings. To those who were unacquainted with his preaching, many of the sketches of sermons in the fifth volume, will lose much of their interest and value. They are like etchings, which an artist who has seen the original paintings, may even prefer to more finished engravings, because they more distinctly present the idea, and his imagination can best supply the expression. Upon the whole, however, we have been delighted to find, that of so many discourses, (no fewer than forty-one,) such ample notes have been preserved. Several of them have evidently been prepared by the Author with great care: some were, indeed, written much more fully than his usual pulpit notes, with an express view, the Editor informs us, to serve as the basis of a projected volume. Even the fullest of them, however, are drawn out only to half the extent of the preached sermons; and in but few is the *application* more than hinted.

'It will not be expected, then,' adds Dr. Gregory, 'that these notes

should evince the exquisite finish, in point of style, which they would have received from their Author, had he prepared them at full length with a view to immediate publication; or that they should abound in those copious and accumulative amplifications of the subjects, or those touching and powerful appeals to the affections and conscience, by which his preaching was so eminently distinguished. Yet, they will be found to exhibit the same simple dignity and grace, often the same beauty and pathos, the same richness and variety of illustration, as his other works; while, if I mistake not, they manifest a more fixed and constant determination to elucidate and apply scriptural truth, a more vivid and awful conviction of the infinite importance of salvation to men who have lost the image and favour of God, and a more deep and pervading current of devotional feeling, than even the most admired of his former publications; eloquent, impressive, instructive, and often truly sublime, as they unquestionably are.' Vol. V. *Advert.* p. iii.

In this point of view more especially, the contents of this volume are peculiarly valuable, and can disappoint no competent judge. They are valuable as illustrations of Mr. Hall's most matured religious sentiments, indicating his advance in spirituality of temper and fervour of devotion, and the increasing strength of his attachment to the distinguishing doctrines of the Christian economy. And they are intrinsically valuable also, as clear and masterly illustrations of the points of theology to which they relate. Although Mr. Hall cannot of course be judged of as a writer, nor as an orator, by these Notes, they are fair specimens of the materials of his preaching,—the organic remains of a giant. Before, then, we proceed to review Mr. Hall's finished writings, we shall gratify both ourselves and our readers by giving a few more specimens of these interesting remains. The xxxth in the series is very strikingly characteristic of Mr. Hall's original and powerful manner of treating those common, hackneyed topics of practical duty or Christian virtue, which are too often substituted by mere ethical declaimers for evangelical teaching, and too often slighted altogether by evangelical preachers. The subject is 'Humility before God'; and the text, James iv. 10. The exordium commences, as usual, with an illustration of the context; and then proceeds as follows.

'Humility may be considered in two views; either as it respects the Divine Being, or as it respects our fellow-creatures;—humility before God, or as it affects our sentiments and conduct towards men. But, while this distinction is admitted, it must be carefully remembered, that it is no longer a Christian virtue, than when it originates in just conceptions of the great Parent of the universe; that the basis of all social excellence, of a moral nature, is in a right state of the heart towards God. The virtues which are severed from that stock, will soon languish and decay; and as they are destitute of proper principle, so are they neither stable nor permanent.

'In this discourse, we shall confine ourselves to the consideration of

humility, in its aspect towards the Supreme Being ; or, in other words, humility before God. It may be defined as consisting in that profound, habitual conviction of our nothingness, guilt, and pollution before God, which a just knowledge of ourselves will necessarily inspire. It is the rectitude of this conviction, it is its perfect conformity to the real nature of things, which renders it the object of Divine approbation. It is the agreement betwixt the lowliness of our minds and the debasement of our character, and the depression of our state, which invests it with all its beauty, and all its value. The gracious notice which this disposition attracts, is not owing to any intrinsic excellence in the object, any more than in lofty sentiments connected with a reflection on ourselves ; but solely because a deep humiliation coincides with our true state and characters, as surveyed by the eye of Omniscience. In a word, it is the justness and the correctness of the feelings and convictions which enter into the composition of a humble mind, which give it all its worth.

‘ Pride is the growth of blindness and darkness ; humility, the product of light and knowledge : and while the former has its origin in a mistaken and delusive estimate of things, the latter is as much the offspring of truth, as it is the parent of virtue.

‘ Let it be observed, that the disposition under consideration is not an occasional feeling arising from some sudden and momentary impulse ; it is not a transitory depression, produced by some unexpected disclosure : in the good man, it is an habitual state of feeling ; it is the quality in which his mind is uniformly attired ; he is “ clothed with humility.” Wide and diffusive as its operation is, some conception of it may be formed by attending to the following observations :—

‘ 1. Humility in the sight of God will have a powerful influence on all our thoughts and reflections ; on ourselves, on our character, condition, and prospects : a sense of inherent meanness and unworthiness in the sight of God will adhere closely to us, and will insensibly, and without effort, mingle with every recollection of the Supreme Being. A sort of self-annihilation before him will be natural and habitual ; and by a recollection of his majesty, and a consciousness of our utter unworthiness to appear in his presence, we shall be no strangers to that ingenuous shame which will scarcely permit us to lift up our eyes to heaven. Under the influence of this principle, we shall be more apt to think of our faults than our virtues ; of the criminal defects with which we are chargeable, than of any pretensions to excellence we may suppose ourselves to possess.

‘ Our faults are our own ; they originate entirely in ourselves ; to us belong all their demerit and their shame : while, for whatever inherent good we may possess, we are indebted to divine grace, which has alone made us to differ. While there is none to share with us the baseness and turpitude of our sinful actions, our virtues are to be ultimately traced to a source out of ourselves. Hence, whatever is wrong in our dispositions and conduct, lays a foundation for unmingled humiliation : what is of an opposite nature supplies no pretext for unmingled self-complacency. Besides, it requires but little attention to perceive that our sins admit of no apology, while our highest at-

tainments in holiness are accompanied by much imperfection: so that, while every pretension to merit is defeated, our demerits are real and substantial. True humbleness of mind will dispose us to form that correct estimate of ourselves, which can only result from an attention to the heart; the secret movements of which we may often perceive to be irregular and depraved, where the external conduct is correct; and innumerable pollutions and disorders may be detected there, by Him "who seeth in secret," when all that is visible to man is innocent and laudable.

Here a prospect is opened to the contemplation of humble piety, which suggests occasion of abasement and humility before God, where [our friends] see nothing but matter of commendation and applause. It is this habit of inspecting the interior of the character, and of carrying the animadversions of conscience to the inmost thoughts and imaginations of the heart, that accounts for that unfailing lowliness and humility before God which is the constant appendage of exalted piety; and which reconciles the highest elevations of religion with the depths of self-abasement. This is sufficient to preserve alive a constant sense of deficiency in the most advanced Christian; of scattering every idea of "having already attained," and of "being already perfect;" and to urge him to press forward towards the prize with unabating ardour. This was the spirit of the great apostle of the Gentiles, and of the most illustrious heroes in the cause of Christ.

The self-reflective faculty is, by the constitution of our minds, so incessantly active, and the idea of self of such frequent occurrence, that its effect on the character must be extremely different, according as it turns to the view its fairest or its darkest side. The habit on which we now speak, of directing the attention to criminal defects, rather than to the excellencies of the character, is not only the dictate of humility; it is the absolute suggestion of prudence. Excellencies are not inspired by being often contemplated. He who delights to survey them, contributes nothing by that exercise to their prosperity or growth: on the contrary, he will be tempted to rest in the self-complacency they inspire, and to relax his efforts for improvement. Their purity and lustre are best preserved in a state of seclusion from the gaze even of the possessor. But, with respect to the faults and imperfections with which we are encompassed, it is just the reverse;—the more they are reflected on, the more fully they are detected and exposed, the greater is the probability that their growth will be impeded, and a virtuous resolution evinced to extirpate and subdue them. To think much upon our sins and imperfections, is to turn ourselves to that quarter in which our business lies. Meditating much on our virtues and good deeds, is a useless occupation, since they will thrive best when abandoned to a partial oblivion.

Some consciousness, indeed, [in the Christian,] of his possessing the features of a renovated mind, and even of a progress in the practice of piety, is almost unavoidable, and is not without its use, inasmuch as it supplies a motive to gratitude, and a source of consolation; but the moment he finds himself drawing a self-complacency from such a retrospect, the enlightened Christian is alarmed, nor will he suffer himself to dwell long upon an object, the survey of which is so

replete with danger. He hastens to check himself in that delusive train of reflection, and to recall to his [mind the persuasion] that he has "not yet attained, nor is already perfect." The recollection that he is a fallen creature, exposed to righteous indignation; that his sins, though remitted, can never cease to be his, nor to retain all their turpitude and demerit; and that he is, whatever his attainments, still a child of disobedience, and a pensioner on mercy;—the constant remembrance of these solemn and momentous truths, is sufficient to preserve a perpetual humiliation in the sight of God.' Vol. V. pp. 287—292.

The second consideration, and that which it was probably the Preacher's main design to insist upon, is, that humility before God will have a beneficial influence on the mind, in disposing it to receive in a proper temper, the discoveries of Divine truth. After some intermediate remarks, the Author thus begins to close with the conscience of the pharisaic formalist.

'With a mind truly humble, the great principle which pervades the Gospel will be found peculiarly congenial; and what is this, but the principle of grace? The whole system of the gospel is emphatically the gospel of the grace of God. It is an exhibition of unmerited favour to a guilty and perishing world; and all the blessings which it proposes to bestow, all the hopes it inspires, are ascribed to this as its origin. Every idea of human desert is anxiously excluded. . . . It is the triumph and pre-eminence of grace that forms the distinguishing character of the Christian system, and which produces that insuperable disgust with which it is contemplated by those who, "going about to establish their own righteousness, refuse to submit themselves unto the righteousness of God." Hence, the attempts are, in many instances, too successful, which are daily witnessed, to disguise this its obnoxious feature, and, by certain extenuations and refinements, to accommodate it to the pride of the sinful and unsanctified heart. Hence, the deplorable infatuation of multitudes, who choose rather to perish in their sin, than to be so entirely and deeply indebted to unmerited favour as the system of the Gospel implies. But, to a mind truly humbled, nothing is more welcome, nothing is more delightful, than the contemplation of revealed truth under this aspect. To feel himself under an unutterable obligation, is no oppressive load from which the contrite in heart is anxious to be released.' Vol. V. pp. 295—7.

This is the last finished sentence of the fragment, which will serve to shew for what purpose Mr. Hall often chose a text of this practical aspect, that he might take the conscience as it were by surprise, when he proceeded to argue, upon the common ground of admitted truths, the higher points to which they were shewn to lead. By inferring doctrinal truths from practical ones, instead of deducing practical inferences from doctrinal statements, he inverted, with equal ingenuity and felicity, the ordinary tactics of the pulpit; and while he seemed to deal less in theological statements, than many of his brethren, he adopted the most effec-

tual plan of both explaining and enforcing the doctrines of Scripture, by shewing the right use of them.

One of the most finished sermons in the fifth volume, is the xxxivth, on the Third Commandment. Having, in the first place, briefly shewn that, in this commandment, are alike forbidden, perjury, and the profane use of the name of God on trivial occasions, whether in mirth or in anger; the preacher proceeds to evince the criminality and impiety of the latter practice, by shewing that it is, 1. in direct opposition to those passages of Scripture which identify the character of God with his name; and 2. an infallible indication of irreverence towards God.

‘As there is no [adequate] method of communicating [thought] but by words, which, though arbitrary in themselves, are agreed upon as the signs of ideas, no sooner are they employed, but they call up the ideas they are intended to denote. When language is established, there exists a close and inseparable connexion between words and things, insomuch that we cannot pronounce or hear one without thinking of the other. Whenever the term God, for instance, is used, it excites among Christians the idea of the incomprehensible Author of Nature: this idea it may excite with more or less force and impression, but it invariably excites that idea, and no other. Now, to connect the idea of God with what is most frivolous and ridiculous, is to treat it with contempt; and as we can only contemplate [objects] under their ideas, to feel no reverence for the idea of God, is precisely the same thing as to feel a contempt for God. He who thinks of [the name of] God, without being awed by it, cannot pretend to be a fearer of God; but it is impossible to use the name of God lightly and unnecessarily, without being in that predicament. It is evident, beyond all contradiction, that such a man is in the habit of thinking of God without the least reverential emotion. He could not associate the idea of God with levity, buffoonery, and whatsoever is mean and ridiculous, if he had not acquired a most criminal insensibility to his character, and to all the awful peculiarities it involves. Suppose a person to be penetrated with a deep contrition for his sins, and a strong apprehension of the wrath of God, which is suspended over him; and are you not [immediately] aware of the impossibility of his using the name of the Being who is the object of all these emotions as a mere expletive? Were a person to pretend to the character of a humble penitent, and at the same time to take the name of God in vain, in the way to which we are now alluding; would you give the smallest credit to his pretensions? How decisive, then, must that indication of irreverence be, which is sufficient to render the very profession of repentance ridiculous!

‘But this practice is not only inconsistent with that branch of religion which [constitutes] repentance; it is equally inconsistent with sincere, much more with supreme, esteem and veneration. No child could bear to hear the name of a father, whose memory he highly respected and venerated, treated in the manner in which the name of the Supreme Being is introduced. It would be felt and resented as a

high degree of rudeness and indignity. There is, in short, no being whatever, who is the object of strong emotion, whose distinguishing appellations could be mentioned in this manner without the utmost absurdity and indelicacy. Nothing can be more certain, than that the taking the name of God in vain, infallibly indicates a mind in which the reverence of God has no place. But is it possible to conceive a state of mind more opposite to reason and order than this? To acknowledge the existence of a Supreme Being, our Maker and Preserver, possessed of incomprehensible perfections, on whom we are totally dependent throughout every moment of duration, and in every stage of our existence, without feeling the profoundest awe and reverence of Him, is an impropriety, a moral absurdity, which the utmost range of language and conception is inadequate to paint. If we consider the formal nature of sin as a deliberate transgression of the divine law, it resolves itself chiefly into this, that it implies a contempt of infinite majesty, and supreme power and authority. This disposition constitutes the very core and essence of sin. It is not merely the character of the wicked, that they contemn God; it enters deeply into the character of wickedness itself; nor is there a heavier charge, among their complicated crimes, adduced against the ancient Israelites, than that they "lightly esteemed the Rock of their salvation".

* * * * *

' 3. The practice of taking the Lord's name in vain is not only a great indication of want of reverence for God, but is calculated to wear out all serious religion from the mind.

' If the most awful terms in religion are rarely or never employed but in connexion with angry or light emotions, he must be blind indeed, who fails to perceive the tendency of such a practice to wear out all traces of seriousness from the mind. They who are guilty of it, are continually taking lessons of impiety; and their progress, it must be confessed, is proportioned to what might be expected.

' 4. The criminality of taking the Lord's name in vain, is enhanced by the absence of every reasonable temptation. It is not, like many other vices, productive of either pleasure or emolument; it is neither adapted to gratify any natural appetite or passion, nor to facilitate the attainment of a single end which a reasonable creature can be supposed to have in view. It is properly "the superfluity of naughtiness", and can only be considered as a sort of peppercorn rent, in acknowledgement of the devil's right of superiority. It is a vice by which no man's reputation is extended, no man's fortune is increased, no man's sensual gratifications are augmented. If we attempt to analyse it, and reduce it to its real motive, we find ourselves at a total loss to discover any other than irreligious ostentation; a desire of convincing the world that its perpetrators are not under the restraint of religious fear. But, as this motive is most impious and detestable, so, the practice arising from it is not at all requisite for that purpose; since the persons who persist in it, may safely leave it to other parts of their character to exonerate them from the suspicion of their being fearers of God. We beg leave to remind them, that they are in no danger of being classed with the pious, either in this world or in that which is to come; and may

therefore safely spare themselves the trouble of inscribing the name of their master on their foreheads. They are not so near to the kingdom of God as to be liable to be mistaken for its subjects.'

Vol. V. pp. 334—340.

This last paragraph affords a specimen of that tremendous style of caustic irony in which, when a fit occasion presented itself, Mr. Hall was so well able to castigate either the hypocrisy or the effrontery of vice, to expose the flippancy of scepticism, or to put down ignorant pretension. Those who knew the native vehemence of his temper, and at the same time his talent for sarcasm, his acute perception of the ridiculous, his ready wit, and his keen relish for the fulminations of indignant eloquence,—could alone appreciate the restraint and control which the governing principles of his heart perpetually exerted, so as to produce an habitual suavity of manners, an abstinence from every thing bordering on splenetic severity, a kindliness of feeling that effectually sheathed his powers of sarcasm. These were, however, consecrated, not destroyed; like weapons of war hung up in the temple. They were reserved, among the other instruments of intellectual warfare, for the combat with Infidelity and Vice; and then only, on the rare occasions which justified their use, it was seen how well able he was to handle them. But it was against things, not persons, errors, not individuals, that he ever declaimed with severity.

Among the subjects which never failed to call forth the strongest expressions of his antipathy, was Modern Socinianism, which, by its disingenuousness and its pestilent tendency, excited alike his abhorrence and contempt. Socinians he regarded as, in their religious character, the enemies of his Divine Master; and he would have shrunk from all religious fellowship with them, as he would from communion with the followers of Mohammed. Equally would he have deprecated, however, treating the persons of individuals, on the pretence of their heresy, with insult or rudeness. Courtesy was part of his religion; but, as he deemed that the courtesy due to all men does not extend to their erroneous opinions, he never hesitated to speak of *these* in unambiguous and adequate terms. We are somewhat anticipating remarks which might seem to belong to a portrait of Mr. Hall's character; but we have wished to point out this material distinction, as it will enable the reader better to appreciate the very striking and forcible manner in which the spirit and tendency of Socinianism are exposed in the fifth sermon of the series; which appears to have been originally prepared as the last of twelve lectures on the Socinian Controversy, delivered at Leicester in 1823. This sermon is so admirably characteristic of the Writer, and appears to have been so carefully prepared, that we cannot refrain from mak-

ing somewhat copious extracts; and must then take leave of the volume which has so long and pleasingly detained us.

— ‘Allow me to close these Lectures by directing your attention to some of the distinguishing characteristics of the system designated by the appellation of Modern Unitarianism.

‘I. It will occur to the most superficial observer to remark, that, as far as it differs from the orthodox, it is almost entirely a negative system; consisting in the bold denial of nearly all the doctrines which other denominations are wont to regard as the most vital and the most precious. It snatches from us almost every thing to which our affections have been habituated to cling, without presenting them with a single new object.

‘It is a cold negation, a system of renunciation and dissent; imparting that feeling of desolation to the heart, which is inseparable from the extinction of ancient attachments; teaching us no longer to admire, to adore, to trust, or to love—but with a most impaired and attenuated affection—objects, in the contemplation of which we before deemed it safe, and even obligatory, to lose ourselves in the indulgence of these delightful emotions.

‘Under the pretence of simplifying Christianity, it obliterates so many of its discoveries, and retrenches so many of its truths; so little is left to occupy the mind, to fill the imagination, or to touch the heart; that, when the attracting novelty and the heat of disputation are subsided, it speedily consigns its converts to apathy and indifference. He who is wont to expatiate in the wide field of Revelation, surrounded by all that can gratify the sight, or regale the senses, reposing in its green pastures and beside the still, transparent waters, reflecting the azure of the heavens, the lily of the valley, and the cedar of Lebanon,—no sooner approaches the confines of Socinianism, than he enters on a dreary and melancholy waste. Whatever is most sweet and attractive in religion,—whatever of the grandeur that elevates, or the solemnity that awes the mind, is inseparably connected with those truths, it is the avowed object of that system to subvert. And since it is not what we deny, but what we believe, that nourishes piety, no wonder it languishes under so meagre and scanty a diet. The littleness and poverty of the Socinian system ultimately ensures its neglect; because it makes no provision for that appetite for the immense and magnificent, which the contemplation of nature inspires and gratifies, and which even reason itself prompts us to anticipate in a revelation from the Eternal Mind.

‘By stripping religion of its mysteries, it deprives it of more than half its power. It is an exhausting process, by which it is reduced to its lowest term. It consists in affirming that the writers of the New Testament were *not*, properly speaking, inspired, nor infallible guides in divine matters; that Jesus Christ did *not* die for our sins, nor is the proper object of worship, nor even impeccable; that there is *not* any provision made in the sanctification of the Spirit for the aid of spiritual weakness, or the cure of spiritual maladies; that we have *not* an intercessor at the right hand of God; that Christ is not present with his saints, nor his saints, when they quit the body, present with

the Lord; that man is *not* composed of a material and immaterial principle, but consists merely of organized matter, which is totally dissolved at death. To look for elevation of moral sentiment from such a series of pure negations, would be "to gather grapes of thorns, and figs of thistles,"—to extract "sunbeams from cucumbers."

'II. From hence we naturally remark the close affinity between the Unitarian system and Deism. Aware of the offence which is usually taken at observations of this sort, I would much rather wave them, were the suppression of so important a circumstance compatible with doing justice to the subject. Deism, as distinguished from Atheism, embraces almost every thing which the Unitarians profess to believe. The Deist professes to believe in a future state of rewards and punishments;—the Unitarian does no more. The chief difference is, that the Deist derives his conviction on the subject from the principles of natural religion; the Unitarian from the fact of Christ's resurrection. Both arrive at the same point, though they reach it by different routes. Both maintain the same creed, though on different grounds: so that, allowing the Deist to be fully settled and confirmed in his persuasion of a future world, it is not easy to perceive what advantage the Unitarian possesses over him. If the proofs of a future state, upon Christian principles, be acknowledged more clear and convincing than is attainable merely by the light of nature, yet, as the operation of opinion is measured by the strength of the persuasion with which it is embraced, and not by the intrinsic force of evidence, the Deist who cherishes a firm expectation of a life to come, has the same motives for resisting temptation, and patiently continuing in well doing, as the Unitarian. He has learned the same lesson, though under a different master, and is substantially of the same religion.

'The points in which they coincide are much more numerous, and more important, than those in which they differ. In their ideas of human nature, as being what it always was, in opposition to the doctrine of the fall; in their rejection of the Trinity, and of all supernatural mysteries; in their belief of the intrinsic efficacy of repentance, and the superfluity of an atonement; in their denial of spiritual aids, or internal grace; in their notions of the person of Christ; and finally, in that lofty confidence in the sufficiency of reason as a guide in the affairs of religion, and its authority to reject doctrines on the ground of antecedent improbability;—in all these momentous articles they concur. If the Deist boldly rejects the claims of revelation *in toto*, the Unitarian, by denying its plenary inspiration, by assuming the fallibility of the apostles, and even of Christ himself, and by resolving its most sublime and mysterious truths into metaphors and allegory, treads close in his steps. It is the same soul which animates the two systems, though residing in different bodies; it is the same metal transfused into distinct moulds.'

* * * * *

'III. A third feature in the Unitarian system is, the unfavourable influence it exerts on the spirit of devotion. It appears to have little or no connexion with the religion of the heart. Of all high and raised affections to God *proudly ignorant*, love to Christ, involving that ar-

dent attachment which enthrones him in the soul, and subordinates to him every created object, it systematically explodes, under the pretence of its being either enthusiastic or impossible The devotional feelings inculcated in the Bible, are intimately and inseparably interwoven with humility and gratitude—the humility and gratitude of a penitent and redeemed sinner. That he who is forgiven much will love much, is the decision of our Lord ; while he to whom little is forgiven will love little. But the perpetual tendency of the Socinian system extenuates the evil of sin, and the magnitude of the danger to which it exposes the sinner, and is calculated to weaken, beyond expression, the force of the motives [they supply].

‘ By asserting the intrinsic efficacy of repentance, to the exclusion of the merits of the Redeemer, it makes every man his own Saviour ; it directs his attention to himself, as the source to which he ascribes the removal of guilt, and the renovation of hope ; nor will it permit him to adopt, in any obvious and intelligible sense, the rapturous language of the redeemed, “ To Him who loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood.” Taught to consider the Lord Jesus Christ in no other light than as the most perfect example and the most enlightened of teachers, and believing that he has already bestowed all the benefits he is empowered to bestow, it is in vain to look for that consecration of the heart to his love, and of all the faculties of body and mind to his service, which may reasonably be expected from him who looks upon himself as a trophy of his power, and as the purchase of his blood. Not viewing himself as at any time exposed to condemnation, you must not expect him to celebrate, with elevated emotion, the riches of divine grace ; much less that he should be transported with gratitude to God for the inestimable love evinced in the gift of his Son ; when he considers it a high attainment to have learned that this Son is a mere man, on a level with himself. The unhappy disciple of this system is necessarily separated and cut off from the objects most adapted to touch the springs of religious sensibility. He knows nothing of a transition “ from death unto life ;” nothing of the anxieties of a wounded and awakened conscience, followed by “ joy and peace in believing ;” nothing of that “ love of Christ which passeth knowledge ;” nothing of the refreshing aids and consolations of that Holy Spirit whose existence he denies, whose agency he ridicules ; nothing of that ineffable communion of spirit with God and the Redeemer, the true element of life and peace ; nothing of the earnest and foretastes of that heaven which his system covers with a dense and impenetrable veil.

‘ Facts, on this subject, concur with theory : for no sooner is a minister of the Gospel transformed into a Socinian, than he relinquishes the practice of extempore prayer, and has recourse to a written form. We are far from condemning the use of forms, where they are adopted from a conscientious preference ; nor can we doubt that many members of the establishment, whose habits have combined with them the most devout associations and feelings, find them useful helps to piety. But, that those who have never used them before, should find them necessary the moment they have embraced a particular system ; that they should feel, as some of the most *eminent* have

confessed, an absolute incapacity, from that time, of praying without the aid of a book, affords a portentous indication of the spirit of that system. To be smitten dumb and silent in the presence of that heavenly Father whom they approached before with filial freedom and confidence; to be unable or indisposed to utter a word without artificial aids, where they were wont to pour out all their hearts; evinces the visitation of a new spirit, but most assuredly not that Spirit "whereby we cry, Abba, Father." Correct, elegant, spiritless—replete with acknowledgements of the general goodness of God, the bounties of his providence, and his benign interposition in the arrangements of society, and the success of the arts and sciences which embellish and adorn the present state—seldom will you hear any mention of the forgiveness of sins, of the love of the Saviour; few or no acknowledgements of the blessings of redemption. An earthly, unsanctified tincture pervades their devotions, calculated to remind you of any thing rather than of a penitent pleading for mercy, "with groanings that cannot be uttered." Vol. V. pp. 31—42.

We must content ourselves with merely indicating the remaining heads of this fine discourse.

'IV. A remarkable feature in the system of Modern Unitarianism, pregnant with more mischief and danger than any of those just mentioned, is, the fatalism and materialism with which, since Dr. Priestley's time, it is almost universally associated.

'V. Another feature in the system, is the tame submission to human authority, which seems to distinguish above all other persons, those who compose the class styled Modern Unitarians.

'VI. The last feature which I shall mention, in the system of the Socinians, is, their zeal for proselytism'. . . 'difficult to be accounted for on their principles.'—Vol. V. pp. 43—46; 22.

There is a very complete sketch of a beautiful sermon 'on the cause, instrument, and purpose of regeneration,' (Jam. i. 18.) which we well recollect to have heard Mr. Hall preach in London many years ago; and a still more interesting sketch of a sermon on Rev. v. 6; 'The Lamb slain, the object of rapture to the heavenly hosts.' Two sermons on 'Spiritual leprosy' (Lev. xiii. 45); the following one, 'On counting the cost' (Luke xiv. 28); an almost complete sermon on family worship (1 Chron. xvi. 43); and the last, 'No temple in heaven' (Rev. xxi. 22); may also be pointed out as not less valuable and characteristic than those from which our specimens have been taken. Further illustrations of the Author's style and method of preaching, will occur in connexion with a review of his published works. We have now to speak of Mr. Hall as a writer.

The first volume of the present edition is composed of 'Sermons, Charges, and Circular Letters.' It contains the Sermons on Modern Infidelity, (preached in 1801,) on War, (1802,) on 'the sentiments proper to the present crisis,' (1803,) and on the advantages of knowledge to the lower classes (1810); the Charge

delivered at Mr. Robertson's ordination, and that addressed to Mr. Eustace Carey; the funeral Sermons for the Princess Charlotte and the Rev. Dr. Ryland; three 'Circular Letters;' and a Sermon never before published, 'on the substitution of the innocent for the guilty,' (Isa. liii. 8.) preached in 1822, and prepared, almost completely, for publication. This Volume, it will be seen, comprises some of Mr. Hall's most finished productions, including the earlier publications by which, chiefly, his fame as a writer was established.

The Second Volume is wholly occupied with the treatise "on 'Terms of Communion;'" the Reply to a "A Plea for Primitive Communion;" and the Reply to Mr. Kinghorn; writings which, both as a model of polemical discussion, and a masterly exposition of principles of far wider application than the comparatively obscure controversy which elicited them, are deserving of far deeper and more general attention than even the name of the Author has hitherto been sufficient to procure for them.

Volume the Third is miscellaneous; comprising, first, Mr. Hall's political Tracts, in the order of their publication, 1791—1824; the Fragment of a Defence of Village Preaching, extending to upwards of seventy pages, and never before printed; and two or three smaller pieces.

Volume the Fourth contains seven articles reprinted from the Eclectic Review; a Fragment on Popery; biographical Memoirs of the Rev. Mr. Toller; Characters of the Rev. R. Hall, of Arnsby, the Rev. T. Robinson, and the Rev. J. Sutcliff; several Prefaces; speeches at the Leicester Bible Society; and other miscellaneous pieces.

The order in which the works are here arranged, is obviously the most proper and convenient that could have been adopted by the Editor; but, in adverting to them for the purpose of illustrating their literary or theological excellence, it will be necessary to consider them as classing under three heads, Theological, Polemical, and Political. And in reference to the intellectual and religious character of their Author, an important line of chronological distinction requires to be drawn, between the earlier publications (that is, those which appeared prior to 1805) and the later writings. Most of the political writings belong to the earlier period; and we shall therefore dispose of these in the first place. But, as the mere fact, that this good and great man did not feel himself restricted from writing upon political topics, or from reprinting one of his early political productions, has been made the ground of base and virulent detraction, we feel impelled to attempt a very brief discussion of a question that may be fairly raised, how far a minister of the Gospel is justified in devoting his attention, and lending his pen to such topics. In this discussion, which must be reserved for another article, we shall avail ourselves of

Mr. Hall's own recorded opinion and arguments; and in the mean time, we shall transcribe the following Note by the Editor of his Works, as a sufficient vindication of his character from the misunderstanding or misrepresentation that has prevailed on this point.

‘ Some excellent persons, who did not know Mr. Hall, often express great concern, that so good a man should have suffered his thoughts to be so much engrossed in politics, as they suppose must have been the case. The truth, however, is, that few men gave themselves less to political matters, than Mr. Hall. At the deeply interesting period in which he wrote his political tracts, the whole world was absorbed in the contemplation of political events, and the discussion of political principles. Among the disputants of the two great parties into which this country was divided, clergymen and other ministers took a most active part, and the class denominated Evangelical were by no means the least active. Some of the most eminent of them, indeed, engaged in that sad and then frequent profanation of holy places and things, the consecration of the colours of a volunteer corps in a parish church; and one even put on a military cockade, in order to incite his parishioners to come forward in the public cause. The genuine principles of our admirable constitution were thought by many to be in imminent peril; yet, all who wrote in their defence were exposed to obloquy. A learned prelate asserted, in the House of Lords, that “the people had nothing to do with the laws but to obey them,” and his sentiment was loudly applauded. In a kindred spirit, during the trials of Muir and Palmer, for “leasing-making,” or sedition, in Scotland, one of the Lords of Justiciary declared, that “*no man had a right to speak of the Constitution unless he possessed landed property* ;” and another affirmed, that “*since the abolition of TORTURE, there was no adequate punishment for sedition*.” In such a season of violent excitement, when upright men of every shade of opinion thought the most valuable principles at stake, no wonder that heats and animosities prevailed, and that all expressed themselves with vehemence,—often with acerbity. Mr. Hall, then under thirty years of age, was of too ardent and generous a spirit to be quiescent in that signal crisis of public affairs. He discharged what, in the exigency, appeared to him an imperious duty, and then remained silent, until, after an interval of many years, at the intreaty of his friends, he broke the silence in a brief effort of self-defence against anonymous misrepresentation. For some years, indeed, so great was his indifference to political concerns, that he scarcely ever read a newspaper, or did more in conversation than advert for a moment, if at all, to public measures. His political principles, however, remained the same through life; with those simple modifications which the lapse of time and the occurrence of new events, were calculated to produce in the breast of a considerate man. Though he thought them important, he uniformly regarded them as subordinate to others. He cherished with delight the anticipations of a new and better order of things amongst mankind; but he looked mainly, for the realizing of his hopes, to the operation of a higher class of principles than the politics of this world can supply,—principles of heavenly origin, which, flow-

ing from Religious Truth, and acting at once upon the spiritual part of our nature, change and improve the mass of society by transforming the characters of the men who compose it.' Vol. III. pp. 201, 2.

(To be Continued.)

Art. II.—1. *Letters to the Rev. Nathaniel W. Taylor, D.D.* By Leonard Woods, D.D. 8vo. pp. 114. Andover (United States). 1830.

2. *The Christian Spectator.* Nos. I. II. III. IV. New Haven, Connecticut. 1830.

SOME importance attaches, on various grounds, to this specimen of American polemics; and we shall give our readers a brief account of it*, subjoining nothing more than a word or two as we pass on.

The preliminary paragraphs of Dr. Woods's pamphlet are not only in themselves highly deserving of perusal, but will serve to explain the circumstances of the controversy. Dr. Woods, Theological Professor at the Andover College, addresses his brother in office, Dr. Taylor, holding a similar station in the college of New Haven; and after adverting to the apostolic rule of controversy (2 Tim. ii. 24), says:—

' My present design, I am well aware, is attended with circumstances of peculiar delicacy. I have undertaken to address myself to a respected and beloved brother, from whom I am constrained to differ: a brother invested with the same sacred office with myself, both as a minister of the Gospel, and a Professor of Christian Theology. And I cannot but notice the circumstance also, that this is no common case; as there has been, in our country, scarcely an instance, before the present, in which a teacher of Christian Theology, in an orthodox Institution, has come before the public in his own name, to controvert the opinions of another man, placed in a similar station. This circumstance, I confess, makes a touching appeal to my feelings; and excites in me a desire which words cannot fully express, that every thing relative to the manner of the present discussion may be unexceptionable. It cannot be thought improbable that, among the professors of our numerous seminaries, there will, from time to time, be differences of opinion, more or less important, and that these differences will be made the subject of free investigation. Now, my dear brother, as we have been led to think it our duty to engage in the difficult, and shall I say, perilous business of publicly discussing controverted points, let us consider well what is before us, and guard, with sacred care, against every thing which

* We are not aware that any other copy than the one before us, has yet reached this country. At any rate, the volume is not very likely to meet the eye of many of our readers.

would render our example unworthy of imitation; or in any way injure the great interests which we wish to advance. Who can count up the evils which might result to the cause of Christ, if our manner of treating controverted subjects should, in any respect, be such as would tend to promote in others around us, and especially in our pupils, feelings of unkindness and acrimony? On the contrary, may we not hope that important good will result from our example, if, whenever we engage in discussing such subjects, under all the excitements and provocations attending public debate, we may be enabled by Divine Grace, to copy the meekness and gentleness of Christ? When I dwell on such reflections as these, I cannot avoid the persuasion, that I should commit a less offence against the Christian Religion by *bad reasoning*, than by a *bad spirit*; and therefore, that I am bound to take as much pains, at least, to cherish right feelings, as to frame right arguments. But a Christian disposition pervading our writings, is not only required by the spirit of our religion, but is necessary to the success of our cause, since, without it, our opinions and arguments, especially those which we may regard as improvements, will not be likely to pass easily and pleasantly into the minds of others; as we may have frequently found by our own experience.

It will undoubtedly be a question with some good men, whether it can, in any circumstances, conduce to the welfare of the Church, for Christian ministers, and especially for professors in our Theological seminaries, to enlist in a public discussion of the topics on which they differ. And I readily acknowledge that controversy, or even the appearance of controversy, among theological professors, is likely to be attended with peculiar danger, as the feelings of their pupils, and the vital interests of their respective institutions, must be so much involved. On this account, I have felt a strong reluctance to take any part in the examination of those peculiar opinions which you have exhibited before the public. But after all, is there any sufficient reason why we should be deprived of the right, or rather exempt from the duty, of bearing testimony against the errors of the day, and especially against whatever we may consider erroneous in one another? Is it not a matter of special propriety, that we should hold ourselves responsible, in a sense, to each other, and to all devout Christians in the community? Is there any thing in our situation, or employment, which can free us from this responsibility? Nay, is it not true that we are peculiarly responsible? And is it not true also, that we are, in some respects, *peculiarly liable to error*? Now, if at any time we are betrayed into wrong opinions, especially if we make those opinions public, can we expect to escape animadversion? Can we justly desire to escape? I well know what noble sentiments you have expressed in relation to this subject; and how often you have invited your brethren to a thorough and unsparing examination of your opinions. And I trust you will now join me in saying—"Let the Christian community watch over our Theological seminaries with an ever wakeful eye. Let these seminaries extend a kind, but faithful inspection over one another. Let no deviation from sound doctrine pass unnoticed. If any of those who are appointed to give instruction to the rising ministry shew the least signs of error; if they only begin to indulge in modes of interpreting the word of God,

or in modes of reasoning on moral or metaphysical subjects, which have an unfavourable, or even doubtful tendency, in regard to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity; let all the teachers of religion in our churches, colleges, and seminaries be awake to the danger. It is far better for the cause of Divine Truth, that this general wakefulness to danger should rise to an extreme; better that solicitude, and fear, and even jealousy should be excited, than that those who are appointed to stand as Zion's watchmen, should slumber on their posts."—pp. 6, 7, 8.

Dr. Woods goes on further to affirm the necessity of vigilance, in regard to the opinions of *public men*, on the ground of the infirmity of the human understanding, even at the best.

'Formerly,' he says, 'when I turned my thoughts towards particular ministers of the Gospel, and particular Christians, I was ready to think it impossible that they should ever abandon any of the truths of Revelation, or embrace any hurtful error. But what I have seen of the human mind during more than thirty years in the ministry, and more than twenty in my present office, has led me to entertain other views on this subject; and has impressed my mind with a serious conviction, that there is no teacher of Religion in our churches, or in our seminaries, no, not one, who can think himself free from the danger of error, or who has not reason to apprehend that a deceived heart may turn him aside. And if, in these days of adventurous speculation, any of those who are called by Divine Providence to instruct in our Theological Schools, should wholly, or in part, renounce the doctrines of Revelation, and become advocates of error, it would only be a repetition of what has often occurred in past ages.' p. 8.

The New Haven Tutor, it seems, has attributed greater value, and given greater prominence to metaphysical theology, or to what is termed *the philosophy of Religion*, than the Andover Tutor can allow; and the latter insists, with considerable force, upon the inefficiency of an abstruse style of pulpit instruction, and upon the importance of adhering, with the utmost simplicity, to the purely Scriptural mode of affirming and enforcing the great principles of the Gospel. We observe that, apparently for the sake of *saving* EDWARDS, he makes a distinction, which we imagine may be much more easily made or stated, than respected, or indeed understood or heeded, in specific instances.

'There is,' he says, 'a wide difference, in point of clearness and importance, between what would be called the philosophy of evangelical doctrines, in one case, and in another. In one case, the investigation may relate to facts in man's intelligent and moral nature, or to principles in the Divine Government, which are certain and obvious. In another case, it may relate to what is uncertain, conjectural, or obscure;—in a word, to what lies beyond the limits of our intelligence. I consider Edwards's metaphysical treatises to be generally of the former character.' p. 11.

This is claiming, we fear, rather too much for the profound Author of the Enquiry concerning Freedom of Will; but we shall not here dispute the point. After stating forcibly the dangers and evils of metaphysico-theological controversy, Dr. W. feels that he is bound to excuse his own conduct in entering upon this ground of argument. He pleads necessity,—the necessity of controverting what he deems erroneous. But why might not his opponent avail himself of an apology equally valid? *He* too has stepped forward to oppose what he thinks prevalent errors. In fairness we must say, that those who inveigh against metaphysical theology, as dangerous or unprofitable, should themselves keep entirely aloof from it.

The second Letter opens the controversy, occasioned by a Sermon of Dr. Taylor's, entitled "*Concio ad Clerum*," and by certain articles contained in the quarterly publication we have named at the head of this article. With more of vivacity, and ingenuity, and activity, (as it seems to us,) than of depth, or comprehension, Dr. T. appears to have flattered himself, that he has shifted the grand difficulties that press upon the question of moral and physical evil, from the position where they chafe our religious notions, by giving a new form to the often-tried expedient of the Optimists.—'There is evil,—there is sin in the world;—true. But who knows whether it *could* have been prevented? God has done the best in his power, for his creatures.'—'Do you know that God could have done better, better on the whole, or better if he gave man existence at all, to the individual himself?' Now his Opponent fairly assumes, from the terms and style of several statements of this kind, that the New Haven Professor's intention is, to affirm an independent or *extrinsic* impediment in the way of a better system of things; and not merely such an impossibility as is to be traced only to the Divine purpose and free choice. He thinks he can relieve theology of its burdens, by throwing the weight of all evil upon some *anterior* impossibility, by which even the Divine power and benevolence were controlled, or limited. Not content with saying,—'God has done what infinite wisdom and benevolence dictated; and He has not done differently, because infinite wisdom and benevolence did not permit, or did not lead to it;' which, Dr. Woods says, is the common theory,—'the theory adopted by orthodox ministers and Christians generally;' the New Haven Professor has employed language which makes quite a different impression.

'To say we have no reason to complain of God for what he has done, because he could not have done better, either on the whole, or for any individual, sounds much like making an apology; and is very similar to what we often say in behalf of a weak, imperfect man, who is incompetent to the work he has undertaken, and, for want of power, fails of doing what he really wishes and endeavours to do. Any being

surely ought to be excused, if he *means* right, and does all he *can*, though not all he would be glad to do. Now your language would seem to imply, that you intend to offer something like this, as a justification of the conduct of God; and of course it would seem to imply, that the *inability* ascribed to God was meant to be understood in the *first*, or *literal* sense. If this was not your meaning, and if you intended to advance nothing different from the common theory, then why should you deny the positions which exhibit that theory, and use language which would be likely to make an impression so different from your wishes? I hold in common with others, that God would have for ever excluded moral evil from the created universe, if he had seen that such a measure would on the whole be most conducive to the object of His benevolence. But it would be very strange, and contrary to all good usage, to express this by saying,—“God *could not* prevent his creatures from sinning;—this is what he *wished*, but was unable to accomplish.” No one uses phraseology like this, except to denote the want of power in the *literal* sense.’ p. 28.

But, when a statement of this kind in naked terms is presented to Dr. Taylor, he rejects the imputation of its being his own opinion; nevertheless, he returns to it, in the general bearing of his argument: for, while he repudiates the common theory, that God *might*, but did not *see fit* to exclude evil from his creation, and therefore will not allow the *impossibility* to be resolved into one of a *moral* kind, he still goes on to say,—‘God could not have done better than he has’; that is, could not consistently with *the nature of things*. What this ‘nature of things’ means, Dr. Woods proceeds to inquire in his third letter.

Not the nature of God, or his attributes, natural and moral, comprehensively; for Dr. Taylor affirms, that these would have inclined him to exclude evil,—*if it could have been done*. Is it then the nature of man? But this nature is God’s work.—No: but the nature of *moral agency* made it impossible wholly to prevent the occurrence of sin, or indeed to lessen the actual amount of it. This position stands in need of proof; and in shewing the fallacy of his Opponent’s method of establishing his doctrine, Dr. Woods very fairly retorts upon him the charge of ‘assuming to know, and of endeavouring to explain, far more than man actually knows, or is competent to explain’:—which same charge is for ever on the lips of Dr. Taylor, and his coadjutors, the Editors of the Christian Spectator.

The Christian Spectator, in reviewing Dr. Taylor’s work, says:—‘So far is Dr. Taylor from opening a new career of rash and fruitless speculation, that his object is, to recal past speculations to greater truth and soberness.’ Again:—‘We pretend not to assert what was, or was not possible with God. Our object has been to inquire, whether men know as much respecting it as some have assumed to know.’

‘Now my impression’, says Dr. Woods, ‘has been widely different

from this. It has seemed to me, that, on this subject, you and those agreeing with you, instead of being less presuming, less forward to *assert* and *decide*, than orthodox ministers and writers generally, have gone far beyond them. The orthodox generally regard the existence of sin under the Divine government as a *profound mystery*. They resolve it into the unsearchable wisdom of God; and pretend not to be able to obviate the difficulties which attend the subject, in any other way than by saying, that the incomprehensible God, for reasons which lie beyond human intelligence, taking a perfect view of His own attributes, and of the whole system of created beings, saw it to be best not to prevent the existence of moral evil; that, in His inscrutable counsels, He chose to admit it into the universe; that, in ways known only to Himself, and by a power which He only possesses, He will make it the means of glory to His name, and good to His kingdom;—that, when He converts some sinners, and leaves others in impenitence, He acts according to His own *sovereign will*;—implying that the reasons for this conduct, which He has in His own mind, and which are perfectly satisfactory to His infinite wisdom, He has not made known to us, nor made us, in our present state, capable of discovering;—so that we can only bow down in humble submission and adoration, and say,—*Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in Thy sight*. When we say, God saw the existence of moral evil to be on the whole for the best, we say it because we believe that all things depend ultimately on His will, and because we are confident that the system which He has seen fit to adopt, must be, in the highest degree, wise and benevolent. If we consider sin as the means of promoting the glory of God's character, and the good of His kingdom, it is because we learn from His word and providence, that He uses it as such. Thus we resolve it all into the infinite perfection and the holy government of that Being, "*of whom, and through whom, and to whom, are all things*"; and the positions we maintain, result directly from our implicit confidence in His wisdom and goodness. We should naturally be inclined to think that God would prevent the existence of sin; but He has not done it. Now we content ourselves with saying, He has not done it, because, in His unsearchable wisdom, He judged it best not to do it. This I consider to be the sober theory of the orthodox.—But you undertake to assign the *specific reason* why God has not prevented the existence of sin. You are not satisfied with saying—He did what He saw on the whole to be for the best:—He did not exclude moral evil, because He judged it best not to exclude it;—He chose and adopted the present system, which includes sin, because, all things considered, He regarded it as adapted in the highest degree to promote the glory of His perfections, and the sum of created happiness. You are not satisfied with this view. But you undertake to go to the bottom of the subject, and to shew particularly *why* God did not prevent the existence or the present degree of sin. You hold, that He did not do it, because He *could* not;—that if He created a system of moral beings at all, it must be a system in which moral evil should exist. You undertake to affirm that there were *only two* things which a God of infinite wisdom and power *could* do;—that there was no possibility of His taking any course, except one of these,—either not to create a

moral system, or to create one which should include sin :—that He had no election between different systems, but only between this system, and no system. You hold, that such is the nature of moral agency, that it was utterly impossible for God to prevent its perversion ; that if moral beings existed, it was unavoidable that some of them should sin, and that Omnipotence itself could not exert an influence upon them sufficient to prevent this. Let God create moral beings in any way He pleases, let Him place them in the most favourable circumstances, exert upon them the highest possible influence, and extend over them the most constant and most powerful protection, let Him watch them with His omniscient eye, and shield them with His omnipotent arm ; still, according to your theory, they will—at least some of them—fall into sin. You think, there is in moral agency itself a power so resistless, that it is impossible for God Himself, however strong may be His desire, to prevent the existence, or even the present degree of sin.

‘I have thus given a somewhat dilated view of what I understand to be your theory, in distinction from the common theory ; and if I have understood you right, I think it must appear, that you have gone beyond the limits of sober judgement. You have undertaken to determine, that God had no choice, and *could* have no choice, between different systems of different degrees of excellence ; and that there was nothing for His wisdom to consider, but the single question, whether He should have a system including sin, or no system at all. Instead of leaving the reason why God chose the present system, as an inscrutable mystery, you have boldly undertaken to remove all the difficulty and all the mystery attending the subject, and to assign the particular and only reason of the Divine choice. So that it is evident that you do not hesitate at all to assert on this subject what *was*, or *was not* possible with God.’ pp. 37, 38.

This is certainly a fair retort. Dr. Woods then proceeds to press against his Opponent’s theory, the capital objections to which it is open ; and they are such as these :—That it supposes moral agents to be otherwise than wholly dependent upon God ;—That God can only in a limited degree either secure their well-being, or control their agency ;—That the alleged impossibility, if it belongs indeed to the inseparable condition of moral agency, must be a *universal* impossibility, and must forbid the preservation of holiness and happiness in any part of the moral world. But the contrary is the fact :—Moral agents have been, and shall be preserved sinless. There may be freedom of will without sin : in other words, God *can* hold up his creatures in their integrity. The universal conditions of moral agency not meeting the necessity of the argument, there must be supposed an impossibility arising from particular circumstances, in single instances. But again, the providence and power of God to arrange all circumstances must be denied, if the existence of evil, in single instances, is to be accounted for by supposing the presence of some circumstances which God *could not overrule*. In opposition to

such a supposition, Dr. Woods maintains, 'that, in all the circumstances in which moral agents exist, God has power to make, 'and to preserve them holy.' And in attestation, he appeals to facts; shewing that, under the most unfavourable circumstances, and in the face of all imaginable obstacles, men have been actually restored to goodness, and upheld in it. While on the other hand, where all means and all circumstances are the most favourable, many remain in their impenitence.

'I pray you, Brother,' says Dr. W., 'to inquire, whether your scheme of thought does not tend towards a denial of all Divine power and Divine influence in the conversion of sinners, except merely such a kind of power and influence as we have over the minds of our fellow men. And it ought to be a subject of serious consideration, whether such a denial would not stand in direct opposition to the declarations of Scripture. If I do not entirely misunderstand the Word of God, He claims a power which is, in its nature, peculiar to Himself,—which entirely distinguishes the Creator from His creatures:—a power which is infinite, and which extends to all the faculties and acts of the human mind and heart, as well as to outward circumstances. And this power of God over the intellectual, and especially over the moral acts of men, and over every thing which goes to constitute their character, is, in its operations, subject to no restrictions, except from the dictates of His holy will; and it is directed and regulated wholly and exclusively by His unerring wisdom. The opinion, by whomsoever advanced, that because *we* can have no direct access to the hearts of our fellow men, and no influence over them, except merely by presenting motives to their view, therefore God cannot, I consider to be an error of the most dangerous tendency. And although that peculiar efficacious power which God claims and exercises directly over the inmost soul of every one whom He converts, creating the heart anew, and influencing every thought and affection, as His infinite wisdom dictates; although this direct and perfect power over the heart, which God claims as one of His prerogatives, is at the present day often, but very erroneously called *physical* power; still, it is none the less a reality for being *misnamed*, and none the less important to the glory of God and the salvation of men.

'I add one thought more. If God is unable to direct and control moral agency, as he pleases, it plainly follows, that He is unable to direct and control those events which depend upon it, or are involved in it. Now nothing is more evident, than that the general course of events in the moral and civil world are inseparably connected with the dispositions and characters of men, and result from them. To assert, then, that God cannot govern the dispositions, and form the characters of men, according to His will, is to assert that He cannot order *events* according to His will. And it will be easy for any one to perceive, that to assert this, is to set aside the truth of the Bible.' pp. 47, 48.

The undefined notion, that there may be a something—an abstract necessity—a conditional impossibility, which controls the Divine benevolence, or limits its exercise, and which therefore

may be loaded with all the blame of moral and natural evil, has manifestly seduced Dr. Taylor, as it has seduced many others, under different forms, to entertain an opinion which is full of inconsistencies. The same impulse was anciently parent of Manichæism; and it has re-appeared from time to time in the Church, under many names. Arminian Free-will has, in modern times, been exhibited as the dire mistress of the moral world, of which the Divine Power itself stood in awe. The American Professor denominates the same lawless authority by a periphrasis which conceals from himself the true purport of his own doctrine. This 'Nature of things', which was at first the mother of sin, and is in each particular instance the *reason* of sin, can in no direction be brought out to view, so that we might know its form and qualities, or *seat*. It appears, however, sometimes to be the inevitable condition of the continued holiness of *any* moral agents, that the defection of others, and its fatal consequences, should be witnessed.—'How can it be shewn from facts, that God could secure any of His moral creatures in holiness, without this influence? Or to what purpose is it to allege instances of the prevention of sin *under* this influence, to prove that God could prevent it *without* this influence?' This is, indeed, a bold assumption,—that there could be no such thing as virtue in the world, if there were no spectacle of punishment! Whatever may be thought of its soundness, its Author, assuredly, is not the person who should be heard to inculcate his brethren on the ground of their 'assuming to know much more than man can know.' Dr. W. alleges, in contradiction of such a presumption, the *fact*, implied or asserted in the Scriptures, that sin was an event subsequent to a primeval state of absolute purity and loyalty in the heavenly world. If this theory be worth any thing, it implies, that sin and its punishment must have been at hand, ready to meet the view of the first created intelligences, at the very first moment of their awaking to the consciousness of moral life;—or, in other words, that sinners must have sprung into existence in the same moment that gave birth to those who were to be preserved in holiness!

In support of his hypothesis, Dr. Taylor is driven upon the old sophism,—that the effective influence of conservatory grace upon the mind, impairs or destroys moral agency. On this point, the conclusive reasonings of Edwards might, one would think, have sufficed to prevent the recurrence of so slender an illusion. A distorted notion, altogether, of spiritual influence,—a notion that is parent of enthusiasm, lies at the bottom of this error. That Divine Influence which is the *cause* of virtue, wherever virtue exists, may as well be deemed incompatible with moral agency, as the constant efflux of creative energy, in the physical world, is incompatible with the exercise of the voluntary prin-

ciple in man and animals. In and by the Creator, all things 'live, and move, and have their being.' But are they therefore not free? Or is moral life shackled by its subjection to an influence equally efficacious and indispensable? Dr. W. follows his Opponent very closely, in his endeavour to establish the strange belief, that the prevention of any sin that has not been prevented, or the conversion of any sinner who has not been converted, must be supposed to have involved certain 'fatal or highly dangerous consequences' to the entire moral system. Nothing can be more gratuitous than such an assumption; nor does it seem to need other refutation than a simple rejection of it. But our Author meets it with contradiction, both abstract and Scriptural. On this latter ground, the single text referred to beneath might be enough.

'I shall refer you to one passage more. (Mark x, 27.) Jesus had represented the salvation of the rich as exceedingly difficult. His disciples, greatly astonished at the representation, said, "Who then can be saved?" But Jesus, looking upon them, said, "With men it is impossible; but not with God, for with God all things are possible." He said this, it will be observed, in reference to the salvation of sinners,—of those whose salvation was most difficult,—of those too who generally were not saved. Jesus declared, as you will observe, that it was *possible* for God to save, or that he *could* save, even rich sinners, (though but few of them were actually saved,) and that he could save them, because he was *omnipotent*; or, as Christ expressed it, "because all things were possible with him." Being *omnipotent*, he was *able* to save those referred to, whether they were saved or not.'—p. 62.

The injunction to pray for the conversion of men, as Dr. W. insists, fully carries with it the supposition, that the Divine Power *might* effect it; as also does the style of Scripture, which represents the conversion of sinners 'as depending upon the *will*, *counsel*, or *pleasure* of God, but never on the condition of his 'having sufficient power to convert them.' But if God possesses and claims for himself the *power* to change the hearts of men, and yet exercises that power only to a limited extent, or according to his own good pleasure, then it can no longer be affirmed, that some abstract necessity, or impediment, foreign to the Divine purposes, sets a bound to the circle of efficacious grace. The imaginary power which is to bear the blame of all the sin and impenitence of mankind, has no place in reason.

Dr. Taylor had affirmed, as mentioned above, that the existence and punishment of sin appear to be the *necessary means* of preserving the loyalty of other moral agents. That is to say, the welfare of the intelligent universe, as a whole, *demand*s the presence of those motives which arise from the spectacle of defection and retribution. Who then would expect to find him,

and in the same page with this affirmation, rejecting with vehemence what he terms the common orthodox *assumption*,—‘that sin is the necessary means of the greatest good;’—for this very assumption (whether in itself true or false) is the ground of his own statement! Palpable inconsistencies belong, of necessity, to a course of reasoning such as this Professor pursues. He cannot allow sin to have been permitted for the sake of a higher good; because his hypothesis declares, that it arose inevitably from ‘the nature of things,’ and that the *necessity* which is its only cause, is altogether independent of the Divine conduct and purposes. But then, when he approaches the same object from another side, and sees that the spectacle of sin and punishment is actually employed in the moral system as a conservative means of virtue, he cannot neglect to avail himself of this reason for its existence; and in hastily taking advantage of it, quite forgets his recent denial of the assumption, that sin is the necessary means of the highest good! One might wonder at such an oversight, if similar instances did not abound in the field of theological speculation.

‘Thus,’ says Dr. W., ‘your reasoning in the one instance, is really a confutation of your reasoning in the other; and if it were only from another writer, I should say, a *direct* and *studied* confutation of it. You first maintain that sin is *not* the necessary means of the greatest good; and then you maintain that the holiness of intelligent beings, which you certainly regard as involved in the greatest good, could not, in any instance, no, not even by the power of God, be preserved without the existence and punishment of sin. *There*, sin is *not* the necessary means of the greatest good; *here*, sin, by its existence and punishment, is the *necessary, indispensable means* of that holiness of God’s creatures in which the greatest good essentially consists.’—p. 71.

Few men stop short on a perilous course, until they have reached some actual mischief. After himself, as we have seen, taking up this assumption, that sin was the necessary means of preserving the virtue of the virtuous, Dr. Taylor turns round upon his brethren, and in a strain, as we should think from the specimens before us, of very crude and ill-considered argument *from consequences*, endeavours to shew that, on any hypothesis but his own, there can be no sincerity in the Divine prohibitions, and no equity in the punishment of sin. This is an old sophism, so often exposed, that a respectable and well informed writer might have known better than to take it up anew.

‘It is obviously your opinion,’ says Dr. Wood to his Opponent, ‘and one in which all orthodox Christians will readily unite with you, that the *prohibition* and *punishment* of sin is (are) necessary to give it a salutary influence in the moral world. Sin, in its own nature, is evil, and as such, must be prohibited by the Divine law; and, if committed, must be punished. Its being prohibited by law, and punished according to

law, is all that gives it a salutary influence, or makes it the occasion of good. Unlike holiness, which, in its own proper nature, is good and of salutary tendency, sin in itself is evil, and directly tends to evil, and becomes the means or occasion of good only *indirectly*, from the manner in which it is treated; that is, its being *forbidden* and *punished*. To this view, I have no doubt, you will fully assent. Now God's law respects sin as *it is in itself*, or *in its own nature and tendency*. He forbids it because it is a wrong and hurtful thing in a moral agent. As sin is in truth totally wrong, hateful, and pernicious, God would not treat it *according to truth*, he would not treat it according to his own feelings respecting it, he would not treat it *sincerely*, if he did not forbid it by his law, or if he did not punish it when committed. It must be evident then, that whenever we represent sin as on the whole for the best, or, according to your manner of speaking, as having an influence by which moral beings are preserved in a state of holiness, we represent it not as it is taken *by itself*, but as *treated in the Divine government*, as *forbidden*, *frowned upon*, *punished*. When let alone, or left to itself, its whole influence and tendency is directly and violently opposed to the good of the universe, or to the holiness and happiness of moral beings; and it is only when condemned by God's holy law, and controlled and punished by his Almighty Providence, that any good can come out of this essential and destructive evil. It is God's righteous government respecting sin, which counteracts its natural tendency, and prevents the pernicious effects which it would of itself produce.—pp. 79, 80.

Nothing can be much more crude, inconsequential, we might say childish, than the inference, that if sin in any way produces good, it ought to be enjoined, and, when perpetrated, rewarded. Yet, thus reasons Dr. Taylor! and he scruples not to pursue the futile objections of the most shallow or the most profane minds, as if they were conclusive against the principle he opposes. And yet, this very same principle he himself builds upon, when it serves his turn.

Speaking of the doctrine he opposes, Dr. Taylor says, that, according to it, the transgressor 'knows that all sin will prove to be the necessary means of the greatest good: how then does it appear that, with this knowledge, he is not benevolent in performing the deed?'

'To so strange a question as this,' replies Dr. Woods, 'I hardly know how to frame a serious answer. The deed in question is, by supposition, a sinful one; performed, as you concede, with a selfish and sinful intention; and yet you ask, "How it appears that the subject is not truly benevolent in performing it?" Which is equivalent to asking, how it appears that a man is not benevolent in performing a deed of malevolence. And this is nowise different from asking, how it appears that love is not hatred, that holiness is not sin; or that any one thing is not its opposite.—The action, I repeat it, is by supposition *selfish* and *sinful*, receiving its name from the intention with which it is performed. Now what is the reason which leads you to change the

denomination of the action, and to speak of it as benevolent? Is the nature of the action, or any one of its attributes changed? No. Is the intention with which it was performed different? No. What reason do you assign for applying to a sinful deed, performed with a sinful intention, so unusual an epithet as *benevolent*? Why, "the subject is apprised of the utility of the deed;" and this circumstance makes the difference. A SELFISH deed, then, if only performed with the knowledge of its utility, may properly be denominated BENEVOLENT!—A singular method of denominating moral actions, according to which they would be called good or bad, benevolent or selfish, not from the intention with which they are performed, but from the knowledge which the agent has of their results! This knowledge of the useful results of a sinful action seems, in your view, to infuse into it a certain quality which counteracts the quality infused by the intention of the agent, and makes a benevolent deed of a selfish one. Yea, this knowledge of the results of a sinful action, appears, in your view, to possess such wonderful virtue, that it transmutes the *intention itself* with which the action is performed, from evil to good; for you very soberly inquire, how it appears, that in this action, (this sinful action,) the agent "*did not really intend good?*" Why, methinks it appears from the fact, *that he really intended evil.*

p. 91.

In his eighth and last letter, Dr. Woods compares the hypothesis of his Opponent with the common belief of Christians, as to the practical tendency of each; and, we think, he fairly proves, that, so far as abstruse dogmas do at all exert any influence over the sentiments and conduct of men, it is far better to leave the subject of moral and natural evil, where the pious mind leaves it, *involved in inscrutable mystery*, at the foot of the throne of God, than, with the hope of disposing of it more satisfactorily, to create, as Dr. Taylor has done, an Imaginary Power, mistress even of the Divine government, and which is to sustain the burden of all sin. A course this, which, if all experience is to be taken as our guide, does but for a moment, and *in appearance*, bring relief to difficulties; while it never fails to involve the mind in endless inconsistencies, and to lead it astray from piety.

The soundness of Dr. Woods's argument, *so far as it is opposed to the theory of Dr. Taylor*, is not the only merit which these Letters possess. They afford an excellent example of the close and pressing pursuit of an antagonist, without (as we can perceive) the slightest improper feeling. There is no vaunting, no contempt; there are no anathemas, and no imputations; but many serious and seasonable cautions, the fruit of experience and sound piety, addressed to one who, as it seems, although a teacher, has much to learn of that wisdom which should belong to men in responsible stations. We thus speak of the respective merits of the two professors, without at all taking our ground

personally as the followers of Calvin, or of Edwards, or of Dwight. That were quite another matter. The case is simply that of an ill-concerted, ill-conducted attempt, on the one side, to conciliate scepticism and irreligion; and on the other, of a temperate and *convincing* exposure of the inconsistencies of the endeavour. Instances of this sort are not without their *lesson*, and should especially be heeded by *young* theologians.

We have in this article spoken of Dr. Taylor solely as occupying an ill-chosen position on the ground of *abstruse theology*. Justice, however, demands that he should have assigned to him a merit he may fairly claim, when he speaks the language of common sense, on the lower ground of practical principles, in relation to the old methods of preaching the Gospel. On this ground, manifestly, there is much (who shall dare to say how much?) to be remedied. On *this* ground, great practical errors have become venerable, in the eyes of religious folk, by usage and patronage. The New Haven Tutor feels this strongly;—attempts a remedy;—mistakes (as we humbly think) the precise nature, or seat of the disease, and does, therefore, as much harm as good; or more. We must take the occasion to say, and we would raise our voice high enough to be heard across the Atlantic, that we shall cheer the American divines, if we see them, in a right spirit, and with Christian temper and humility, earnestly plying their forces upon the great practical question of the *primitive* mode of calling men to repentance. It would do no good to agitate such a controversy just now in England. We are in no condition to handle any grave matter to great advantage. But if the AMERICANS cannot, and do not, follow truth with freedom, and modesty, and to some efficient purpose,—shame upon them! If they would but ask us, we (that is, we Eclectic Reviewers) would propose to them a string of inquiries, for their immediate consideration, not one of which should be trivial, and not one of which can we hope to see satisfactorily disposed of among ourselves.

Art. III. *Reflections on the Politics, Intercourse, and Trade of the Ancient Nations of Africa.* By A. H. L. Heeren, Knight of the North Star and Guelphic Order, &c. &c. Translated from the German. 2 Vols. 8vo. pp. xlvi. 528; xvi. 428. Price 1*l.* 10*s.* Oxford, 1832.

PROFESSOR Heeren's "Sketch of the Political History of Ancient Greece", received the tribute of our cordial praise in a former volume*; and we then expressed a hope, which we are gratified at having so far fulfilled, that his entire works might

* Eclectic Review, Third Series, Vol. V. p. 443.

be made accessible to the English reader. It is in vain to look for works of such laborious and profound research from the scholars of our own country in the present day; and we ought to be thankful, therefore, for the privilege of importing the growth of Germany. Heeren is not merely erudite; he is also an eloquent writer. He is original, without being fanciful; enthusiastic without being visionary; vivacious without flippancy; learned without being obscure or dull. Of the present Translation, it is satisfactory to know, that its correctness has received the sanction and commendation of the learned Author himself.

‘At the request of the Publisher of these volumes, Professor Heeren kindly took upon himself the task of reading over the sheets before publication; a task to which his knowledge of the English language rendered him competent, and which the numerous corrections he has made, shew him to have executed with much care and attention. Soon after the first thirteen sheets had been transmitted to him, the learned Author writes: “I have read them with attention, and attest that they are made with a due knowledge of the two languages, and with all the accuracy which I could desire. I should be well content if the continuation should be executed with the same diligence, and if the whole of my works should be presented in this form to the English public.”’

After so high a sanction, it can scarcely be necessary for us to bear our testimony to the great and successful pains which have evidently been bestowed upon the work by the Translator; who speaks of his own qualifications in the most modest terms, and claims no other merit than that of having ‘executed his task with fidelity, and thereby contributed his feeble efforts for the ‘advancement of knowledge.’

The Contents of these volumes comprise: 1. A General Introduction to the Author’s Reflections upon the Nations of Antiquity, taken from the beginning of his volume on the Persians. 2. A General Introduction to this portion of the work, relating to the ancient Nations of Africa. 3. History of the Carthaginians, in eight chapters. 4. History of the Ethiopians, in three chapters. 5. History of the Egyptians, in five chapters. 6. Appendix of ancient documents, in Vol. I. 7. Appendix to Vol. II.

The first General Introduction affords a very concise but luminous and philosophical view of the origin of government, commerce, and civilization. The first bond of community existing among men was, beyond all question, Professor Heeren remarks, the natural one of domestic ties; out of which grew what has been denominated the patriarchal state. This bond of consanguinity is always found much more extensive and powerful among savage tribes, than among civilized nations.

‘The different members of the family do not, as with us, devote

themselves, as soon as they have attained a certain age, to various occupations in the world without, and thus separate from the parent stock. All pursue the same occupation, whether it be hunting or the tending of cattle. Consequently, the families remain united: they gradually form tribes, and the tribes, nations. The distinction of tribes is universally prevalent, and no less influential among the savages of North America or Australasia, than among the half-savage inhabitants of Central Asia, or of the deserts of Arabia and Africa. The members of the same tribe settle or migrate together: and although the first formation of such societies was undoubtedly the effect of a law of nature, yet, their common interest must have confirmed and strengthened the bond of union, as providing for their mutual defence and security during their continual petty wars. It is always the case, that tribes of this sort are subjected to a despotic authority possessed by the head of their race; who owes his power to the patriarchal privileges of his birth, and consequently is sometimes tempted to indulge it, till it becomes an oppressive tyranny: at the same time that the dependents of other chiefs are no wise sufferers in their personal freedom.' p. ix.

The origin of civil government, however, properly so called, is to be traced to the concentration of a fixed and various population in cities, where the ties of consanguinity, and the distinctions of clan and tribe, would soon lose their influence, and the necessity for council and concert would originate some rude political constitution. Law would, of necessity, take the place of hereditary rights and traditional usages, not only because tradition could not supply rules for the new circumstances of the community, and that it would no longer be enforced by the same powerful sanction, the tenacious attachment of the tribe to its distinguishing customs; but because Law would be required to arbitrate between differing usages and conflicting traditions, and to subordinate them to its own authority. Every city was, of necessity, a republic; and the free states of antiquity were nothing more than cities surrounded with their peculiar districts. Without renouncing, however, their original character, such republics were often enabled in various ways to extend the limits of their power and territory, and even to become the mistresses of empires; as, for instance, Rome and Carthage.

'When several communities belonging to the same nation were situated near each other, they naturally formed a mutual alliance, especially when the pressure of enemies from without, drove them to combine their means of resistance. In such cases, it was natural that the most considerable state or city should place itself at the head of the confederation, and assume a precedence which almost necessarily degenerated into a species of domination; of which we see examples in the conduct of Rome towards the Latin states; of Tyre, with respect to the Phœnician; of Thebes, with respect to those of Bœotia, &c. Nevertheless, the inferior cities would still continue to lay claim

to a certain independence. In questions affecting the whole confederacy, such as those of peace and war, the superior State might sometimes carry its claims of precedence to the extent of an absolute supremacy; but, so long as her general authority remained unquestioned, she did not much concern herself with the internal polity of the inferior states, or with matters which only affected them individually. Such a precedence enjoyed by the principal State, will readily explain, how cities, insignificant in themselves, were able to attempt and achieve conquests, aided in many cases by a combination of favourable circumstances, with men of talent and spirit at the head of affairs, and enjoying the resources which their navigation, commerce, and mines supplied.' Vol. I. pp. xiii, xiv.

But, besides this class of States, history presents us with another class, totally different in all the circumstances of their creation and constitution, in the *great monarchies* of antiquity. These were of two descriptions; those which grew out of the ancient hereditary law of patriarchal authority, and consisted in the ascendancy of a particular family over a single tribe or people; in which manner, in Epirus, Macedonia, and other countries, the family of their native princes maintained itself on the throne; and, those which originated in the invasion of predatory hordes of pastoral and equestrian nations, by habit warriors, allured from their barren country by the prospect of booty, or compelled to emigrate to more fertile regions, which they overran, pillaged, and subdued. An absolute monarchy, or, in other words, a military despotism, is the only government that could be founded on the right of conquest, or by which the authority of the conqueror could be maintained. Such great monarchies, however, are the meteors of history: they were generally as rapid in their decline and fall as in their rise. The greatest conquerors of ancient, as of modern times, Sesostris, Cyrus, Alexander, Sultan Mahmoud of Ghizni, Timour, Nadir, Napoleon, had no successors to their vast dominion. Nothing is permanent that does not assume the character of institutions; and no institutions have been permanent, that have not been in some way connected with religious sanctions. The following remarks are well deserving of attention.

'When we reflect, that all civil societies which deserve the name, are associations of freemen; that it was not possible that any thing like political wisdom or sound philosophy should have regulated their first formation; that the very desire of security and mutual defence which contributed to their creation, was not likely to be at all times equally urgent, and might sometimes be forgotten;—when all these considerations present themselves to the mind of the inquisitive historian, he feels that, in the infancy of the human race, such communities could not have been held together, except by a more durable and powerful bond than all of these,—that of *Religion*. There is no conclusion which political history supplies, more remarkable than this: that the further we advance in the history of any nation, the greater

becomes the influence of religion in state affairs. On the present occasion, I use the term *religion*, to express the barbarous reverence which uncivilized nations have always paid, by certain rites and customs, to imaginary deities; under whatever form they may have been represented or conceived to exist. To convert such a religion into a bond of political union, it is only necessary that it should possess, in each nation or tribe, a *national* character, as is generally the case; since, as is proved by a multitude of examples, every nation is easily led to adopt certain gods as its peculiar and tutelary deities. Such an idea,—of a tutelary deity the common protector of the whole nation,—is obviously an invisible bond of interest and alliance. From being an invisible bond of union, it is calculated to become a visible one also, and in this respect is especially influential. As soon as the worship of their deities became connected with some particular spot, and took place in some national temple or sanctuary, with public festivals at which all the nation, and only that nation, assisted,—so soon was there established among them a principle of *unity*, independent of external circumstances, and allied to the innermost feelings of man. In this manner, the temple of the Tyrian Hercules became the centre of the Phœnician League; that of Jupiter Latialis, of the Latin Confederacy; and thus it was that the Grecian States, discordant in their forms of government, and disunited by frequent wars, yet, felt themselves to be members of one community, when assembled to celebrate the festival of the Olympian Jupiter.' Vol. I. pp. xv—xviii.

In the same manner, the *Kaaba* of Mecca has been the centre of the Moslem States; and to nothing but the bond of religion, does the temporal power of the Head of the Mohammedan world owe its conservation. The *firmaun* of the Ottoman Sultan is not merely a command, but a spell: it is not only an imperial order, but a *bull* ecclesiastical. The temple of St. Peter at Rome has been the *Kaaba* of the Romish world. But the false religions have, in this as in other respects, been the deformed copies of the true. The nationality of the Jews was essentially maintained by their temple, the bond of their political union, the centre of their religious polity, the true metropolis of the world. But if a national religion is a bond of internal union, it is also liable to become a source of international hostility and hatred. The nationality which was thus fostered, displayed itself in a more intense hatred of other nations, the worshippers of other gods. In such cases, a difference of religion inflamed, but did not originate the mutual jealousy and hostility; and what have been called religious wars, whether in ancient or in modern times, might be shewn to have sprung from national hatred. Thus, the worshippers of the Crocodile and those of the Serpent, who might have agreed together in the same city, became inveterate enemies, when Ombos and Tentyra were peopled by rival and probably jealous communities. In many instances, the gods were hated for the sake of those who worshipped them, rather than the worshippers

for the sake of the gods. This was probably the case with regard to the great religious war between the Brahminical and the Buddhic tribes of India, which issued in the extermination or expulsion of the latter: it was a war of clans or of nations, and religion was but one element of the nationality which fostered it. In the same manner, the bitter animosity between the Greek and the Latin, which has subsisted for centuries, cannot with any reasonableness be ascribed to the trivial differences in their rites and polity. It is the result of national antipathy.

Thus, all false religions must at once be a source of internal unity, and an occasion of foreign war and discord; and, excepting the Jewish, all *national* religions must be false. The truth of Christianity is staked upon its universality; and it aims at nothing short of at once destroying and superseding that nationality which isolates while it unites, and corrupts society, while amalgamating it. When we say that all national religions must be false, we mean, of course, all religions which professedly consist in rites and worship peculiar to a particular nation, and tending to infuse into it a spirit of nationality; which cannot possibly apply to the Christian religion except as *paganized* by Romish corruptions. That which was designed, and is destined, to be the religion of all nations, can alone be a bond of international amity and universal peace.

But to return to our Author. It is true, he remarks, that religion (that is, as already defined, the barbarous reverence paid by uncivilized nations to imaginary deities) can afford no such bond of union to a variety of nations of different origin and *various creeds*.

‘ In as far, indeed, as the religion of the conquering nation superseded those of the conquered, it exercised of course a considerable, but not a universal influence; but its principal efficacy, in such cases, consisted in its introducing *legislation*, which opposed, as it were, some bounds to the overwhelming violence of military despots, and limited what it could not control. Legislation, to be effectual, and to insure respect, demands the sanction of a higher authority. Among nations which have already attained a certain degree of intellectual cultivation and political constitution, the laws, it is true, will of themselves command respect, because men have had time to be convinced that obedience is a duty; but such sentiments were not to be looked for among rude and uneducated tribes, who were not disposed to venerate the laws, except so far as they were sanctioned by religion. For this reason, in the earliest ages of antiquity, civil institutions, not less than those which were of a character strictly religious, bore the impress of Religion; and even in the present day, we see an example of it in the case of all those nations which own the authority of the Koran. Among the Greeks and Romans also, the enactments of Lycurgus and Numa were sanctioned by the authority of the popular religion. Such a state of things naturally caused the establishment of a

sacerdotal race, as a distinct order, or even *caste*, (the customs of the East differing in this respect from those of Greece and Rome,) which necessarily attained the highest influence in political questions; an influence which, although occasionally abused, was not without its good effects in limiting the omnipotence of the monarch. Religion also prescribed certain ceremonies which all were equally bound to observe; and the duty of observing them, and the forms they imposed, placed some salutary limits to the power of the sovereign.'

Vol. I. pp. xviii, xix.

'*Ainsi les erreurs mêmes ont leur utilité quelquefois ; mais c'est ordinairement pour remédier à d'autres erreurs ; et la vérité vaut mieux absolument*'*. This profound remark of Leibnitz admits of extensive application ; and it holds good, in particular, of those practical errors and fallacies which have embodied themselves in the institutions of society. Errors in religion and government have sometimes proved useful as counterpoisons to the diseases of society,—as temporary remedies for greater evils,—when truth was not to be had. Thus, a heathen priesthood may have operated as a check upon a heathen despot ; and a false religion may have originated a beneficial legislation. In the same way, amid the prevalence of feudal ignorance and ferocity, the monasteries of Europe were the only asylum of learning, the barriers of civilization ; and there was a period when the liberties of Italy were identified with the cause of the Church. The struggle for ascendancy between the military and the sacerdotal castes, which, under the various modifications, is seen agitating society at all periods and in all countries, may be regarded as essentially a struggle between the principles of liberty and despotism. So long as the priesthood have been *subject*, they have been the protectors of those beneath, and, as the only class of free men under a military despotism, the mediators between the despot and the vassal. When the military power has been subject to the hierocracy, then, indeed, as in Egypt and in India, the worst species of despotism is the result ; that which combines oppression with falsehood, working by means of an atrocious legislation and a debasing superstition. The worst abominations of Polytheism have been the artful invention of a sovereign or dominant priesthood. To prevent this unnatural and fatal combination, the Mosaic law forbade the union of the sacerdotal and regal office in the same tribe : nor does Christianity less absolutely interdict that unnatural combination of the spiritual and secular functions, which has been one of the main sources of the corruption of religion. Thus, while we cannot read history intelligently, without perceiving that many things in themselves

* Leibnitz. Theodicée, Pref. p. 298.

evil, have, under existing circumstances, proved of limited and temporary use, as the best expedients for counteracting greater evils; we may also see, that those remedial evils, if we may so term them, have a constant tendency to swell into excess, so as to become in turn, as soon as they touch the point of ascendancy, greater in magnitude and more disastrous in operation. It is thus with every false principle of social union,—national prejudice, superstition, feudalism, priestcraft; although human society, in its corrupt state, has been chiefly kept from total dissolution by the alternate and reciprocal operation of these miserable expedients. But *la vérité vaut mieux absolument*—‘Truth exhibits a more excellent way.’

As the origin of all civil society is to be traced to the formation of cities, so, the formation of cities may in most cases be ascribed to the parent of civilization, commerce. As the commerce of antiquity was carried on principally by land, the personal safety of the merchant and the interests of trade required the adoption of the system of caravans, with fixed lines of route and places of rendezvous. These places of repose and defence, Professor Heeren suggests, would become *entrepôts* of commerce, and not unfrequently the sites of temples and sanctuaries, under the protection of which the merchant prosecuted his trade, and to which the pilgrim resorted. Superstition has seldom exerted so useful an influence, as when, the patroness of commerce, she has interposed to screen the trader from the robber, the merchant from the warrior, though sometimes also the offender and the impostor from the magistrate. This mode of communication between distant regions, which always creates a considerable *intermediate* trade, had the effect of creating emporia of commerce along the whole line of route, which, being frequented by the numbers attracted by the love of gain, gradually grew up into flourishing cities, and following the usual progress of refinement, increased in wealth and civilization,—in luxury and commerce. Thus, all the great cities of antiquity are found in the caravan routes leading from the remote regions of the *Seres* and *Indi* to the shores of the Mediterranean. The routes were not primarily determined by the cities, but the cities sprang up in the geographical route; and when the stream of commerce was diverted from its original channel by war, or by the discovery of a better route, the towns which it had created, declined, and often sank into utter decay. Some trade, indeed, was, from the earliest times of which we have any historic record, carried on by sea; but it was almost entirely a coasting navigation, subordinate to the land traffic, and, from its tediousness and uncertainty, employed only from necessity, or confined, at most, to narrow seas. The commerce of the ancients forms one of the most interesting subjects of historical inquiry; for all that was admirable in their polity and institutions may be

shewn to have grown out of it. War and conquest, the favourite topics of the bard, which comprise the romance of history, have in all ages been the great barbarizers of the species. The epochs of the Macedonian and Roman empires, Professor Heeren remarks, are far from being the most important or the most instructive, in respect to even the polity of the ancients.

‘The variety which distinguished the Ancient forms of government, was necessarily overwhelmed by an universal dominion; and Commerce herself was apt to be fettered with the same bondage in which every other civil relation was confined. We must ascend to a more distant age, if we would contemplate the constitutions of the Ancients in all their diversity, and their commerce in its most tranquil and flourishing condition. The period immediately preceding the establishment, and during the continuance of the Persian monarchy, appears to offer to the historian the most satisfactory survey and the richest field of inquiry. By examining this epoch, we shall be enabled to estimate correctly the commerce of Alexandria of a later date, and the questions arising out of the political systems of the Romans and Macedonians. In like manner, by ascending to the age referred to, we behold, as it were, every thing in its proper place, before the success of one nation had deprived the rest of their independence. Every commercial state then occupied the rank and position in the general system, for which it appeared to be designed by its peculiar advantages. The shores of the Mediterranean were inhabited in every direction by industrious and seafaring nations. Carthage had occupied the greater part of the coast of Africa, and, by opening her ports for the importation of foreign produce, had already begun to monopolize the commerce of the interior. Cyrene was the immediate neighbour of Carthage, and had become her rival, by her possessions along the eastern portion of the same coast. Over against these cities, the Grecian colonies of Sicily and Italy had grown, by the cultivation of their fruitful territories, to a degree of opulence and prosperity which, in the end, proved fatal to them. Their narrow limits could with difficulty produce as much oil and wine as was absorbed by the neighbouring country of Gaul, and the boundless continent of Africa; which were either altogether barren of these productions, or afforded them sparingly and with difficulty. Italy was then principally in the hands of the *Etrusci*, a nation who, in spite of the jealous rivalry of Carthage, maintained themselves in the Mediterranean: while the *Romans*, pent up as yet within the limits of Latium, were content to carry on a peaceful traffic, and conclude a treaty of commerce with their future enemies, the Carthaginians. The internal commerce of Gaul was in the hands of *Massilia*, the most peaceful and prosperous of all the Grecian states; while, on the coast of Spain, *Gades* and other independent Phœnician colonies, were mistresses of fleets which even braved the waves of the Atlantic.

‘The States of Greece, more particularly Athens and Corinth, with their Ionian dependencies, had secured to themselves the commerce of the *Ægean* and the *Black Sea*; and even Egypt, exclusive as it was

(under the dominion of the Pharaohs) in all its institutions, had opened at Naucratis a free port for Grecian commerce. The later kings of this ancient dynasty went still further, and, with the hope of making themselves masters of Phœnicia and Syria, removed their residence from Memphis to Sais, and equipped fleets at the same time on the Arabian Gulf and the Mediterranean. The nations of Central Asia were brought into closer contact by the levies of the Assyrians and Babylonians; and even the compulsory migration of some conquered nations, (the first expedient which despotism in its infancy devised to maintain its conquests,) was not without some beneficial result, by making different nations better acquainted with each other,—with their productions and their demands. The haughty *Babylon*, formed by her very position for the seat of empire and of commerce to the rest of Asia, had already become the resort of the arts and civilization; while Tyre and the other Phœnician states maintained their rights as the principal channels of communication for the trade of Asia and Europe: a trade which, though momentarily disturbed by the Persian conquest, presently resumed its former current. Under the dominion of the last, the whole of Central Asia assumed the internal arrangement of a settled empire. The traveller pursued without difficulty his way along the high roads from Sardes to Persepolis and Bactra: and the very remains of their palaces, decorated with the representations of public feasts, on occasion of which the different nations are portrayed as presenting their offerings before the throne of the monarch, are even now a striking proof of the industry and arts of the people, and the wise government of their kings. If to this outline we add the commerce of Southern Africa and Ethiopia, carried on by means of caravans communicating with Carthage and Tyre, across the deserts of that continent, we are presented (in the period we are contemplating) with a picture of life and activity,—of the commerce and combinations of mankind,—extending over the fairest portions of the globe, and affording the historian a surprise and pleasure proportioned to the multiplicity of the objects it embraces.

‘Of this splendid picture, we shall attempt to delineate at least the principal features. To this end, we must cause the warlike races which usually occupy the most prominent place on the stage of history, to withdraw awhile, and make room for more pacific and unassuming nations. Let the march of devastating armies give place to that of peaceful caravans; and instead of ruined cities, let us contemplate the more pleasing spectacle of newly founded and flourishing colonies.’

Vol. I. pp. xxxvi—xxxix.

This extract will at once convey a general idea of the Author’s design, and serve as a fair specimen of the pleasing style in which the work is written. The present portion relates to the nations of ancient Africa. Forty years have elapsed since the learned Author first laid before the public, his “*Reflections upon the African Nations*”; since which, the progress of discovery, the information collected by Burckhardt and other travellers, and the successful researches of Champollion, have poured a flood of

light upon the enigmatical obscurities of African history and geography. The history of Carthage is the most imperfectly known. Indeed, of the brilliant period of her prosperity, we have no account, her native writers having long been lost; and the story of her decline alone is preserved in the annals of her great rival and destroyer. Carthage was one of many colonies established by the Tyrians on the southern shores of the Mediterranean. Utica is supposed to have been still more ancient; and it continued to rank second only to Carthage, till, after the ruin of the latter city, it became the capital of the Roman province of Africa. The history of Ancient Carthage divides itself into three periods. The first extends from the foundation of the city, B.C. 878, to the commencement of the wars against Syracuse, B.C. 480. This interval comprises the rise and growth of the State, its extension in Africa, Sardinia, and the smaller islands of the Mediterranean, and the commercial wars with the Massilians and Etrurians. The second period, extending from the commencement of the Syracusan to that of the Roman wars, from B.C. 480 to B.C. 265, includes the era of its greatest power and extent. The third period includes the history of its wars with Rome, its decline, and final overthrow, B.C. 146. Colonial Carthage, the imperial capital of the Gordians, the see of Cyprian, and the seat of the African primacy, though inferior in extent as well as political greatness to the Phœnician city, maintained the historic splendour of the name, till the Roman power fell in its turn before the Saracen, and the site was once more (A.D. 698) consigned to desolation.

The topography of Carthage has never received adequate illustration. The account given by Shaw, on which Professor Heeren is disposed to build, has been called in question by Chateaubriand; a writer of small authority indeed, but his objections, fortified by the observations of an able engineer, deserve attention. It is not a little remarkable, that the situation of the ports, the very circumstance to which the city owed its glory, should be precisely the point of the greatest obscurity. With regard, however, to any architectural remains that might be discovered, they would be those of the Roman city, not of the Phœnician, which it must have effaced: the theatre, the aqueducts, and the marbles which Edrisi represents as still serving for a quarry in the twelfth century, must all have belonged to the Colonial city. The territory of Carthage extended eastward to the frontier of Cyrene; and Capt. Beechey supposes the common boundary to have been at a place now called Bengerwad, where the mountains that run parallel with the beach, approach very close to the sea*. The highly interesting volume which details the

* Beechey, p. 189.

results of the survey made by that gentleman in 1821, 2, had not appeared when Professor Heeren composed this portion of his work; and he has chiefly relied on the unsatisfactory statements of Della Cella. The Translator has referred, in a note, to Capt. Beechey's volume, as well as to a work which the Professor would have found of important service in his geographical inquiries, the *Modern Traveller, Africa*; in which the descriptions furnished by Della Cella, Beechey, and Pacho are compared with each other, and, so far as they admit of it, combined. Westward, the Carthaginian territory was bounded by the Numidian kingdom, in about the meridian of 8° E. The river 'Tusca, which now divides the kingdom of Tunis from that of Algiers, was, probably, the ancient boundary. Of their provinces, the first in importance was Sardinia, the largest of the islands of which they became completely masters. Till very lately, this was the least known of any part of Europe; even Taheite and Hawaii, Professor Heeren remarks, being better known to us than Sardinia; and 'the knowledge of the ancients respecting it was equally scanty.' The Carthaginians jealously interdicted all strangers from approaching it; a policy which the Author supposes to have been adopted on account of the rich produce which they drew from the Sardinian silver mines. Corsica appears never to have been entirely brought under the dominion of Carthage; nor was Sicily at any time wholly in her possession. It was in this island that the interests of the Carthaginians came into direct collision with those of the Greeks, and that the opposite spirit of their policy was brought into contrast.

'Both of them here possessed cities; but those of the former (the Carthaginians) were soon eclipsed by those of the latter. The Greek cities were free, independent States; and that, combined with the extraordinary fruitfulness of the soil, and the unobstructed sale of their merchandize, enabled them to raise themselves to a considerable pitch of opulence and power. Those of Carthage, on the contrary, were founded with all that economy, and watched with all that jealousy, which are peculiar to suspicious, niggardly merchants. The best among them would not bear a comparison with Agrigentum, much less with Syracuse.' Vol. I. p. 74.

The Balearic Islands and Malta fell at an early period into the possession of the Carthaginians, having previously received Phœnician settlements. In Spain also, as in the islands of the Mediterranean, they are supposed to have 'trode in the footsteps of their forefathers, the Phœnicians, who, from time immemorial, made that ancient Mexico the chief object of their voyages, and there formed settlements, some of which became, in their turn, opulent and powerful states.' We are referred to another portion of the Author's work for illustration of this statement. Andalusia, which appears to have been at all times more African

than European, was the proper territory of the Phœnician colonies; and from the intercourse of the settlers with the ancient inhabitants, sprang a mixed race called *Bastuli*, similar to the Liby-Phœnicians in Africa. Gades, the seat of the Tyrian Hercules, the national god, took the lead of the maritime cities which they founded; and the close connexion between Carthage and that city, was an important advantage.

Hence they drew the best of their mercenary troops; and the harbour of Gades served at the same time as a station for their vessels in their distant voyages beyond the Pillars of Hercules, along the shores of the ocean. The mines of this country, and the rich treasures which they yielded, were nevertheless the great points of attraction. These had already been opened and worked by their forefathers, the Phœnicians. Here, then, the way was again ready paved for them; and they most probably attempted, in the infancy of their settlements, to turn these mines to account. Even during their Sicilian and Libyan wars, they were enabled by them, according to the express declaration of Diodorus, to maintain the mighty armies which they at that time raised; and the mines which the Romans at a later period worked, had all been previously opened by the Carthaginians. . . . The relations of Carthage with Spain, during the whole of her most flourishing period, were altogether of a peaceable nature. She enjoyed all the advantages which this rich country could bestow, without risk or expense; and simply because she had sufficient moderation to prefer a quiet intercourse to the glitter of conquest. The silver mines, whether under her dominion or not, were equally beneficial to her; as, by the profitable sale of her wares, she received the treasures they produced. The Spanish tribes were her friends and allies, and willingly served in her armies for a moderate pay. Carthage long enjoyed the fruits of this policy: her treasury was filled, and her argosies rode widely undisturbed across the seas. The pressure of circumstances which time brought about, compelled her to change this policy; but they arose out of a series of misfortunes, which gradually sapped the foundation of the Republic, and caused her overthrow. Vol. I. pp. 86, 7.

There is no example of any great republic, Professor Heeren remarks, either of ancient or modern times, that did not, so far as its geographical position admitted, become a conquering state; nor one to whom its ambitious policy did not prove ultimately fatal. Athens and Sparta, Rome and Carthage, Venice and Genoa, each in turn became conqueror and conquered. When the spirit of commerce passes into a desire of conquest, the principle of political health has already become vitiated; and though decline may not begin, disease, the sure precursor of decline, is already at work. Such is one of the most legible lessons of history. Our limits will not allow us to follow the Author through the interesting chapters relating to the government, commerce, and military establishments of Carthage. On the subject of their religion, we are referred, in a note, to a learned treatise

by Bishop Munter, (Copenhagen, 1822,) which we have not seen. Their deities, by which we may trace their close connexion with their Phœnician ancestors, were those to whom the Romans gave the names of Hercules, Saturn, and Neptune; but the Tyrian Hercules, whom the Carthaginians called *Melcart* or *Melek-kartha*, (i. e., according to Bochart, king of the city,) was the Syrian Adonis, the same as Osiris and Krishna, whose worship was altogether foreign from that of the Greeks and Romans. Thus, Hercules appears in their mythology, like Boodh in the Brahminical legends, in a subordinate and degraded form; whereas, in the primary worship, Hercules, like Boodh, was supreme, and typified some modification of the power of nature. Saturn, or Chronos, the *Moloch* of the Hebrews, the *Zohal* of the old Arabians, and the *Maha-Cali* of India, is distinguished, under all his names, by the sanguinary nature of his worship. Human sacrifices were offered to him in Phœnicia and other countries; but the Carthaginians were distinguished by the horrid nature of their rites, worthy of Ashantee. Professor Heeren has a curious remark on this subject, in a note. 'It is true, that the number of human sacrifices was greater among the Carthaginians, than among other nations; but what was it, compared with the thousands destroyed by the Spanish Inquisition?' With equal propriety might it be asked, what was it compared with the hundreds of thousands destroyed by war? Both questions are alike irrelevant. The burning of a heretic in the character of a civil offender, atrocious as is the act, and contrary to the spirit of Christianity, is *not* 'a modification of the same idea' that has led to the offering up of human sacrifices as a propitiation to the offended gods; nor is the comparative heinousness of either practice to be estimated by the number of the victims. The superstition of the Carthaginians must have been strongly tinged with a fanaticism truly African, if it be true, as Diodorus states, that three hundred men willingly devoted themselves to death as sacrifices. This self-devotion exceeds that of the followers of Karmath or Hussun Subah, the 'Shiekh of the Mountain;' and the recklessness of life which seems to have characterised these Carthaginians, tempts us to suppose that the Ashantees must have sprung from a colony of the same people. This sanguinary worship was probably practised chiefly in the decline of the State. We may infer this, from the obvious motive of such sacrifices,—the propitiation of malignant deities in time of public calamity;—from the historical fact, that sanguinary rites are generally found to be superinduced upon a milder superstition, as the worship of Seeva in India, is of posterior origin to that of Vishnoo or Boodh;—and from the very high probability that the priesthood must have gained a strong ascendancy, and become corrupted by that ascendancy, before the people could be brought

to consent to so infernal an expedient. The primitive worship of the Carthaginians was probably directed to the goddess of the mariner, Astarte, Ashtarothe, or Cœlestis, Isis or Dian. The precincts of the temple of Venus, in the Colonial Carthage, occupied an area two miles in circumference. The *Panagia* and the Madonna of the Greek and Sicilian mariners, is the successor of the Cytheræa of the Egean, and the Venus of the Adriatic. As to the Carthaginian Neptune, whose native name has not even been preserved, he was, probably, closely related to Typhon or Saturn; for the sea seems to have been personified and worshipped as an active or masculine element, only in the character of a destroyer; and the genial influence invoked by the mariner, was always feminine.

The chapter on the Land Trade of Carthage, has required Professor Heeren to attempt an elucidation of the ancient geography of Interior Africa. The caravan trade of Carthage seems, he remarks, to have been one of its state secrets. It consisted, like the modern trade, chiefly of dates, salt, slaves, and gold. Gold dust has been the loadstone which has drawn the Moorish caravan across the desert into the heart of Nigritia, where salt is a more precious commodity. Professor Heeren considers it as evident, that the *Nasamones* of Herodotus actually reached the Negro lands beyond the desert, and that the river to which they penetrated was the Joliba. He differs entirely from a writer in the Quarterly Review, who asserts, that Clapperton has 'completely demolished every possibility of the Quorra's being the great river of Herodotus, which stopped the Nasamones.' In a note inserted at the end of Volume II., there is an allusion to the recent journey of Lander, who is represented as having ascertained, that the Joliba discharges itself into the Bight of Benin. In an article on the Course of the Niger, which appeared some years ago*, we threw out the conjecture, that the waters of Nigritia, when the lakes are swelled by the rainy season, may discharge themselves partially by means of the rivers of Benin; but we must confess that we retain no small degree of scepticism as to the supposed discovery, that they have no other outlet. 'Even now,' our Author justly remarks, 'the general course of the rivers of Soudan is very imperfectly known; and the question how it came to be believed by the ancients, (a belief which still exists,) that the Nile flows from the west, and that it communicates with the Joliba, remains unanswered.' The ascertained facts, that the Yeou or Gambaroo, after reaching the meridian of 11°, in lat. 12° 17', bends eastward, and maintains that course to Lake Tchad,—that the Shary flows from the west,—and that the Joliba conti-

* Eclectic Review, 3d Series, Vol. II. p. 20.

nues to flow in a s.s.e. direction as far as the parallel of 8° ;— seem to concur in rendering it highly probable, that the Niger (by which we mean the Timbuctoo river, the only stream the ancients could refer to) sends forth a portion of its waters, by some branch or intermediate lake, towards the east. The Yeou, which is said to come from the hilly country between Adamowa and Yacoba, may possibly prove to be such branch; and in that case, the only problem will be, what becomes of the waters of Lake Tchad. Ibn Batuta expressly affirms, that the Nile of *Tambactu* descends from that city to a town at the extremity of *Mali* or the Foulah country; thence, to Yuwi (or Yaour) a district in Soudan; and from that place, to Nubia (Sennaar), Dongola, and Egypt*. The native information collected by Mr. Bowdich, is to the same effect; and strange indeed will it be, should it prove, that in every age, from Herodotus down to Major Denham, the natives have concurred in a consistent story, without any foundation in truth, and with no conceivable motive for the falsehood—mistake, it cannot have been. If Mohammed Ali would oblige us by sending one of his educated subjects from Sennaar to Be-gharmi, with proper instructions, the whole secret would be unravelled.

The route described by Herodotus, is, according to Professor Heeren, no other than the caravan route between Upper Egypt and Fezzan. Setting out from Thebes, (the point from which the Historian reckons all distances relating to places and nations in interior Africa,) his Travellers proceed to the Ammonian Oasis, and thence, across the desert of Barca, to Augila. From that place, they proceeded to the country of the Garamantes, which is easily identified with Fezzan, or Phazania, of which Germa (or Garama) was the ancient capital. Caravans still pass between Fezzan and Egypt, by way of Augila; and Zuila, the easternmost town of Fezzan, where the merchants have their *rendezvous*, is styled the Gate of Egypt. The Garamantes are represented by Herodotus as going in chase of the Ethiopian *Troglodytæ* in four-horse chariots; which *Troglodytæ* are described as the most swift-footed of all men, reptile-eaters, and speaking a language which resembled the shriek of bats.

‘The hunting of the human race,’ remarks Professor Heeren, ‘is so little out of use, that the Sultan of Fezzan still carries it on annually; substituting, however, for four-horse chariots, a body of cavalry and infantry. While Captain Lyon was there, an expedition of this kind took place under the command of one of the Sultan’s sons; and the father wept tears of joy, when he returned from the *grazzie*, (for so is this expedition called,) with 1,800 prisoners composed of old and young men, women, and children. In this respect, then, Africa has always

* Lee’s Ibn Batuta, p. 238.

remained the same. Besides this, a trifling circumstance mentioned by Herodotus, respecting the language of these people, is confirmed in a manner we could hardly have expected. "They have no language like other men," says he, "but shriek like bats."—"When the Augilians speak of these tribes," says Hornemann, "they say, their language is similar to the whistling of birds." Vol. I. p. 224.

Captain Lyon thought the Tibboo language, which is full of liquids and sibilants, 'really very pretty'; but their mode of salutation, by reiterating for a long time *la la!* might give rise to the idea, that they had no proper language. They are frequently, he adds, called 'the Birds'; but this he supposes to refer to their proverbial agility. They are described as quiet, inoffensive, and timid, trembling at the very sight of a gun, and living in constant dread of their ruthless visitors, the Tuaricks, who keep up the practice of their ancestors in the days of Herodotus.

The route from Carthage to Fezzan, lay along the coast as far as *Leptis Magna*, and then, turning southward, followed the same line as the present caravan route from Tripoli to Mourzouk. Beyond the Garamantes, at the distance of ten days' journey, dwelt the Atarantes; and at the distance of another ten days, the Atlantes, with whom Herodotus confesses that his knowledge ended. Professor Heeren would identify the former station with Tegerry, where the Arabic ceases to be spoken, and the Bornouese takes its place; and he points out some apparent coincidences, slight and equivocal, yet remarkable, between the Atarantes and the people of Bornou. The last station, that of the Atlantes, he places at Bilma, the capital of the Tibboos, mid-way between Mourzouk and Lari, the frontier-town of Bornou. The language of the Historian with regard to these people, borders, it must be confessed, upon romance. 'Adjoining the salt hill near which they live,' he says, 'is a mountain, the name of which is Atlas; it is narrow and round on every side, and is said to be so lofty, that it is not possible to see its top; for the clouds never disperse from about the summit, whether in summer or in winter. This mountain, the natives say, is the pillar of heaven, and from it those people take their name: they are, in fact, called Atlantes.' Professor Heeren's exposition of this passage is as follows.

'The district of Bilma, we are told by Lyon, is very mountainous, having large rocky tracts of perfectly black stone. Some of these rocks are so high and steep, that their tops are scarcely visible; or, as the Arabians express it in their figurative language, "you cannot see their top without losing your cap." According to the latest travellers, it is upon these rocks that are situated, in order that they may be secure from the attacks of the Tuaricks, the four towns of the Tibboos, of which Bilma is the most important. Bilma is the great salt mart for the negro countries: thirty thousand camel loads are yearly carried

from its salt lakes by the Tuaricks to Soudan. Nature herself prescribes this commerce, as no salt is to be found further south. Does not this offer us a very natural reason why Herodotus's information respecting these tribes should end here? It was the great market where the tribes exchanged their commodities with one another. A similar circumstance occurs in the steppes of Central Asia.' Vol. I. pp. 234, 5.

It is not correctly stated, that the towns of the Tibboos are built upon these rocks. Bilma stands in a hollow; and Ashenumma in a recess of the Tigemma hills, immediately under one of the loftiest points in the range,—‘an insulated hill about 400 feet high, with sides nearly perpendicular.’ But it is true, that, on the approach of the Tuaricks, the population flock to the top of these natural fortresses. The town of Anay consists of a few huts built on a similar mass of rock, round the base of which are also habitations; but the property of the inhabitants is always kept aloft, through fear of the freebooters. In case of alarm, Major Denham says, they take refuge at the top of the rock, ascending by a rude ladder, which is drawn up after them; and as the sides of their citadel are precipitous, they defend themselves with their missiles, and by rolling down stones on their assailants*. As Herodotus was compelled to rely upon hearsay information, it is not very surprising that he should have fallen into a mistake as to the height of these inaccessible rocks, or have been misled by some such figurative phrase as the Arabs still employ. The sandy ridge, Herodotus represents as stretching as far as the Pillars of Hercules, and even further; and throughout the whole extent of it are found, at intervals of ten days' journey, the masses of rock salt, or salt mines, (ἀλὸς μέταλλον,) and a settlement round each. By this sandy ridge, it is evident that he must mean the high table land of the Sahara itself, to which his description accurately applies; and dating his information from Upper Egypt, he would very properly describe the desert as stretching further westward than the Pillars of Hercules, the most westerly point of the maritime Africa. The name Atlantes might possibly receive explanation from some native word, which the Historian would seem to have confounded with the Mauritanian Atlas.

The remainder of the ancient route must be made out by conjecture, but it doubtless coincided with the present line. Five miles to the s.w. of Bilma, is a place called Kisbee, which, being the frontier town of the Tibboos in that direction, is a great place of rendezvous for all *kafilas*. Eight days further to the s.w. is Agdass; and sixteen days from Agdass is Kashna (or Cassina),

* Modern Traveller, Vol. xxi. pp. 193, 4.

situated in lat. 13° N., formerly the chief emporium of all Houssa. Since the Fellatah conquest, Kano has become the largest trading town; but Kashna is still 'the favourite resort' (necessarily so from its position) of the Tuaricks who frequent Soudan in the dry months. There are two daily markets there, Capt. Clapperton tells us; one held in the northern quarter, which is chiefly attended by merchants from Gadamis and Tuat; the other in the southern, which is attended by the Tuaricks. The town is built upon one of the many long ridges of syenite that run from N.N.E. to S.S.W.* Kashna, however, being nearly in the centre of Soudan, would not be the first town at which the ancient caravans arrived. To the north of Kano, in lat. $13^{\circ} 7' 14''$, is the town of Quarra, situated on the northern bank of the Quarrama, a mile and a half W. of its junction with a river (the Zarrie) flowing from the S.W. It is a walled town containing between 5000 and 6000 inhabitants, chiefly Fellatahs; and during the dry season, we are told, a number of Tuaricks from Bilma, arrive there with salt, and lodge in huts outside the walls. This town is situated even more to the northward than Saccatoo, and might seem therefore to be not far from the frontier: if so, it would be the first town in the route from Agdass to Kashna. The Quarrama is represented as flowing westward to Saccatoo, four days from which place it enters the Quorra. But all the torrents of Kano are said to run towards the east. Ridges of granite, running to the north-east, and enclosing verdant and well watered valleys, appear to divide the waters flowing in opposite directions. The route taken by the *Nasamones*, after they had reached the fertile country beyond the desert, is described as leading across some vast marshes, before they reached the great river running from west to east, and containing crocodiles. Now, this account remarkably agrees with the nature of the country between the town of Quarra, at which we suppose they would first arrive, and the Niger. The Quarrama and the Zarrie are described by Clapperton as forming 'a chain of lakes and swamps extending through the greater part of the plains of Gondamee, almost to Soccatoos'; while a ridge running N.N.E., separates these lakes from the latter city. From the somewhat obscure and not very consistent description given by this Traveller, we may infer, that Soccatoos is to the north-west of the direct line of route to the Niger, which would lie across the swampy plains in a south-west direction, following, probably, the course of the Zirmie river, which traverses the district of Cubbé, till it enters the Niger, flowing eastward; that is, south-eastward. The Kano caravans proceed to a town called

* Denham and Clapperton, Vol. ii. p. 390.

Koolfie, 'the emporium of Nyffee', situated on a stream called by Clapperton the Mayarrow; (the furthest point reached by the Bornou caravans;) whence the Houssa merchants pursue their route to the Quorra, which they cross at *Wonjerque* (the king's ferry), at the village of Comie, 'where it is all in one stream' 'about a quarter of a mile in width, and ten or twelve feet deep'; and continue their journey to Youriba and Borgoo. 'This is, however, the southern road, leading towards the coast. The direct route from the northern frontier of Soudan to the Niger, would strike the river considerably above Boussa; probably near the Kawkaw (or Kaugha) of Ibn Batuta and Edrisi, which is described as a large and beautiful city, between Timbuctoo and Cubbee.

At all events, the relation given by Herodotus is too consistent with geographical fact, to be set aside as a mere fable; nor can we regard it as at all doubtful, that the river which the *Nasamones* are described as reaching, was the Timbuctoo Nile. That this was the Nile of Egypt, or connected with it, the Father of history mentions only as a conjecture. Strictly speaking, this cannot be true, and his hypothesis must be considered as founded upon imperfect information; but that the waters of Soudan and those of Sennaar communicate, is attested by so remarkable a concurrence of tradition and native report, that it will require much better evidence than we at present possess, to satisfy us that the belief has no foundation.

We have wandered from Carthage too far to return; and must not enter upon the remaining subjects of these volumes,—Ethiopia and Egypt. We need scarcely add a word in recommendation of a work so replete with historic interest, and characterized alike by enlightened views and profound learning.

Art. IV. *The Anti-Slavery Reporter.* Jan. and Feb. 1832.

‘**I**N the (Jamaica) House of Assembly, in the month of November last, Mr Lynch, one of the members of it, speaking of the intentions of Government with respect to Slavery, as indicated by Lord Howick's speech in the House of Commons on the 15th of April, 1831, said: "Our watchword at present ought not to be *conciliation*, but *resistance*".' While this insolent tone has been held by the mock parliament of Jamaica towards the Government and Legislature of this country, an insurrection has broken out in the western district of that island, which, though it will not teach them wisdom, may serve to rebuke their madness, if, indeed, it shall not prove to have been fo-

mented by their own agents. In the absence of all satisfactory explanation, we beg to call the attention of the public to the following facts, which appear on the face of the official documents.

1. The Governor, Earl Belmore, states in his official despatch *, that this 'extensive and destructive insurrection' 'has followed a 'season of unusual sickness and distress': whether poverty and distress among the slaves, or among the planters, is not very clear. But it is added: 'The planters complained of poverty and distress; and the *delegates* sent forth an ambiguous declaration, 'deprecating (as they expressed themselves) the insidious attempts to undermine and render valueless what little remains of 'their property; but,' adds his Lordship, 'the brink of danger 'on which they stood, formed no part of their deliberations.' Thus, then, the planters were at once turbulent and desperate; complaining of distress, and blind to their danger; indisposed alike to conciliate their slaves, or to comply with the requisitions of the Mother Country. And the slaves probably knew that their masters were assuming this attitude of resistance, which left *them* nothing to hope for.

2. The negroes of several estates, 'had expressed their determination not to work after New Year's Day',—in consequence of their having been impressed '*with a general and firm belief*, that after Christmas they were to be free'. The ring-leaders who suffered death, 'all declared, that they had been told 'by *white people*, that they were to be free at Christmas, and 'that by these people the plan of insurrection had been arranged.' 'They will have much to answer for', remarks Lord Belmore, 'who have deluded these unfortunate people into expectations which have led to such scenes of devastation and ruin, and which now recoiling upon themselves, numbers must 'expiate by their deaths.' Sir Willoughby Cotton's statement is in these words: 'The whole of the men shot yesterday, stated, 'that they had been told by *white people for a long time past*, 'they were to be free at Christmas, and that their freedom-order 'had actually come out from England, but was withheld; that 'they had only to strike work *en masse*, and they should gain 'their object; that the whole of the estates in Trelawny and St. James's had agreed to do so; that, if they were attempted to be 'forced to turn out to work, they were then to fire the properties, 'but not the canes, or the provision-grounds, or their own huts; 'that this would make the proprietors come to their terms. The 'above is corroborated by the testimony of several others now under trial and in prison.'†

* London Gazette Extraordinary, Feb. 22.

† Despatches, No. 25.

3. Our readers will note, that the negroes had for a long time past laboured under this delusion; and the fact, that such was their impression, Sir Willoughby expressly states, was known to their taskmasters. 'That the overseers, or attorneys, or magistrates should not have acquainted the Executive Government with the extent to which the determination of the negroes had gone all round this district, *not to work after New Year's Day, without being made free*, is MOST ASTONISHING; as it would appear to have been made known on almost all the estates, that these were the sentiments of the negroes.'* Alluding to this passage in Sir Willoughby's letter, Lord Belmore writes: 'Sir Willoughby Cotton expresses his astonishment I had not been made acquainted with the determination of the negroes not to work after New Year's Day. I have now the honour to enclose copies of two letters, dated the 29th and 30th of July, addressed to custodes of parishes, from none of whom I received unsatisfactory accounts; nor has any complaint reached me of insubordination among the slaves, or any disposition to insurrection, although the members of Assembly from all parts of the island, had only separated, on adjournment, from the seat of government, *on the eve of the insurrection*.' In the two letters referred to, which are Circular, and dated five months prior to the insurrection, the Custodes are informed of Lord Goderich's disclaimer of any intention on the part of His Majesty's Government to adopt measures at variance with the spirit of the resolution of the House of Commons in 1823; the extract from the despatch from Lord Goderich being enclosed; to which document His Excellency requests them to give the greatest publicity, with a view to 'remove any alarm or apprehension which some of the parochial resolutions may have excited in the minds of the community at large.' In the confidential letter accompanying the one designed to be made public, His Excellency's request is communicated, that the Custodes would endeavour to make themselves acquainted with the general conduct of the slaves in their respective parishes. 'And *should any circumstance arise*', (it is added,) 'to require the adoption of *further measures*, in order to remove any *erroneous impression* they may have received of the designs of His Majesty's Government, you will be pleased to give His Excellency *the earliest intimation of it*. In making this communication to you, His Excellency desires you will understand, that he places the most implicit confidence in the good conduct of the slaves; and he only suggests a *vigilance*, which is at all times more or less necessary, *but more particularly so when discussions have taken place, which are liable to misconception and misrepresentation*.'†

* Despatches, No. 30.

† Nos. 31 and 32.

Well then might Sir Willoughby Cotton represent it as *astonishing*, and the astonishment of Lord Belmore might well exceed that of the Commander-in-chief, that the overseers, attorneys, and magistrates, who were well aware of the erroneous impressions that prevailed among the negroes, should have unanimously disregarded His Excellency's request, and have withheld all information from the Executive Government, as to any discontent or disposition to insurrection, although the members of Assembly from all parts of the island had separated from the seat of Government only *on the eve of the expected insurrection*. This, we agree with Sir Willoughby, and the public will, we think, agree with us, is '*most astonishing*.' But there is something else to be told, that will excite a similar feeling.

4. *How long* the slaves had been suffered to remain under erroneous impressions of the design of His Majesty's Government, we are not informed; but we have the proof before us, that it must have been at least as far back as the early part of the year; for, on the 3d of June, 1831, a proclamation was issued from the King in Council, which we must transcribe.

‘ WILLIAM IV.

‘ Whereas it has been represented to us, that the slaves in some of our West India Colonies, and of our possessions on the Continent of South America, *have been erroneously led to believe*, that orders have been sent out by us for their emancipation; and *whereas such belief has produced acts of insubordination*, which have excited our highest displeasure; we have thought fit, by and with the advice of our Privy Council, to issue this our Royal Proclamation; and we do hereby declare and make known, that the slave population in our said colonies and possessions will forfeit all claim on our protection, if they shall fail to render entire submission to the laws, as well as dutiful obedience to their masters: and we hereby charge and command all our governors of our said West India Colonies and possessions, *to give the fullest publicity to this our proclamation*, and to enforce, by all the legal means in their power, the punishment of those who may disturb the tranquillity and peace of our said colonies and possessions.’

This royal proclamation, designed expressly to undeceive the slaves, and to counteract a spirit of insubordination, which would reach Jamaica some time in August, was first communicated to the slaves *after the insurrection had broken out*, having been kept back by his Excellency, notwithstanding the royal command to give it the fullest publicity, for no other reason than because he did not deem it necessary!! So at least His Excellency is made to say in the Circular dated Dec. 22, 1831. We do not believe that this was his reason. Governors have their advisers; and in such a matter doubtless Earl Belmore acted *with advice*. Here, however, is the language ascribed to him:

King's House, Dec. 22, 1831.

‘His Excellency the Governor, having received intelligence that a disposition to insubordination has manifested itself amongst certain slaves on a plantation in St. James’s, His Excellency *no longer hesitates to give every possible publicity* to His Majesty’s proclamation, which the uninterrupted tranquillity that has hitherto prevailed throughout the island, has *not seemed to render necessary*.

‘I am directed, therefore, to transmit to you printed copies of this proclamation, and His Excellency requests that you will *cause it to be read to the slaves* by the persons in charge of the several plantations in your parish.

‘I have the honour to be, &c.

‘W. BULLOCK.’

Now when Lord Belmore penned the remark, that ‘they will have much to answer for, who have deluded these unfortunate people into expectations which have led to such scenes of devastation and ruin,’—did it never occur to His Excellency, that they must have at least something to answer for, who wittingly suffered them to remain under those delusions? Lord Belmore knew, (for the terms of the Proclamation prove this,) that such erroneous expectations had long prevailed;—that such belief had produced acts of insubordination; he was aware that discussions had taken place, which were liable to misconstruction; he required no report from the custodes or any other persons to make him acquainted with circumstances that rendered ‘vigilance’ ‘more particularly necessary.’ And yet, he deems it *unnecessary* to take the most direct step for obviating the danger and removing the erroneous impression. He hesitates, month after month, to give publicity to the Royal Proclamation, obviously designed for immediate publicity. Instead of this, he begs the Custodes to give him the earliest information of any circumstance that might require the adoption of ‘further measures.’ The Custodes, aware of the discontent, of its cause, and of the impending danger, suffer New Year’s Day to approach, without giving any information to the Governor. The slaves are suffered to believe, that ‘their freedom-order had actually come out from England’; learning, no doubt, that a royal proclamation had arrived, and ignorant of its contents; but naturally inferring, as well they might, from its being withheld, that it was favourable to their interests. Or if the fact, that a Royal Proclamation had been received, was not known to the slaves, still, they had been led and permitted to cherish expectations, which the angry and seditious declarations issued by their masters, and directed against the Government of this country, might seem to render reasonable. Notwithstanding all this, these truly ‘unfortunate people’ are permitted to remain under the mistake the Proclamation was intended to remove, till it had actually excited them to revolt;—and then, a few days

before martial law is proclaimed, Lord Belmore no longer hesitates to reveal the secret, and to suffer the Royal Proclamation, for the first time, to be read to the slaves ! Truly, there *are* individuals who have much to answer for.

5. The circular giving publicity to the Royal Proclamation, bears date the 22d of December. The proclamation placing the island under martial law, was issued on the 30th. Whether the order to give publicity to the Royal Proclamation was generally complied with in the interim, does not appear. There would not seem to have been found any opportunity for it. A letter from the custos of Trelawny, Mr. J. Macdonald, dated the 26th, '*acknowledges the receipt of the proclamation*'; and contains the following passage :

'I have this instant read a despatch from Sir W. Cotton to Major Pennefather : it is certainly an extraordinary document. He says, the troops are not to act until the riot act is read, and unless His Majesty's troops are insulted. The negroes are already strongly impressed with the idea, that the King's troops have instructions not to act against them ; and certainly, if this despatch were published, it would confirm their opinion. I hope, most sincerely hope, this order will be countermanded : if not, His Majesty's troops, *who are so well paid by the country*, will be of little service to us.' *

Sir Willoughby's despatch to Major Pennefather, does not appear among the documents ; but it was no doubt in strict coincidence with his proclamation 'to the rebellious slaves', issued from head-quarters, Jan. 2d, which does him high honour, and to which well-timed step, Commodore Farquhar ascribes the immediate change of affairs for the better †. It is as follows :

'To the Rebellious Slaves.

'Negroes. You have taken up arms against your masters, and have burned and plundered their houses and buildings. Some wicked persons have told you that the King has made you free, and that your masters withhold your freedom from you. In the name of the King, I come amongst you to tell you that you are misled. I bring with me numerous forces to punish the guilty ; and all who are found with the rebels, will be put to death without mercy. You cannot resist the King's troops. Surrender yourselves, and beg that your crime may be pardoned. All who yield themselves up at any military post immediately, provided they are not principals and chiefs in the burnings that have been committed, will receive His Majesty's gracious pardon. All who hold out, will meet with certain death.

(Signed)

'WILLOUGHBY COTTON,

'Major-General Commanding.

'God save the King.'

Our readers will observe that, so far as appears, this proclamation was the *first* attempt made to disabuse the insurgents of the

* Despatches, No. 3.

† No. 33.

false impression under which they were known to labour. Mr. J. Macdonald says, indeed, in his letter of Jan. 4*, that all the negroes were acquainted with his Majesty's proclamation, as, immediately on his receipt of it, (acknowledged Dec. 26,) he had 200 copies thrown off and distributed all over the country. Sir Willoughby does not appear to have relied upon this alleged distribution, which, if it took place, must have been had recourse to *after* the insurrection had broken out; and no proof is offered, that the insurgents were made acquainted with it in the only effectual way, by having it read to them. Sir Willoughby Cotton ordered such prisoners as could not be convicted, to be dismissed, after having his Majesty's Proclamation *read to them*. But Mr. J. Macdonald, with whom Sir Willoughby is no favourite, objects to this most proper measure as unnecessary, because *he* had distributed 200 copies of the proclamation! This is another circumstance adapted to excite astonishment,—if any conduct on the part of the whites of Jamaica can astonish. We should exceedingly like to see one of those 200 copies distributed by Mr. J. Macdonald. Of course, it would prove to be a verbatim copy of the Royal Proclamation. Still, why the negroes should not have it read to them officially, even if they had heard it once read before, and even if they had been so fortunate as to catch one of the 200 copies,—we cannot understand.

After all, the 200 copies which are represented as having been distributed 'all over the country', may have been, through some mistake, distributed only in Mr. Macdonald's own neighbourhood. 'I am happy to inform you,' he writes to Mr. Bullock, (Jan. 4,) 'that every estate under my charge have continued faithfully at their work, and completely protected their master's property, which is very gratifying to me. I do not wish to make any insidious (invidious?) remarks; but if other gentlemen had acted with the same kindness, and *taken the same pains to explain the real nature of things as I have done, I do not think that this unfortunate insurrection would have been so general*; as, in St. James's in particular, their vengeance seems to be pointed against certain individuals.' This, it is remarked in the Times Newspaper of Feb. 23, 'is no unimportant admission for a Jamaica planter, who had committed a preacher to prison.' And it is the more remarkable, taken in connexion with the alleged distribution of the Royal Proclamation, tardy as it was, among the slaves on the estates under Mr. J. Macdonald's own charge; by which means they were made acquainted with 'the real nature of things.' Nothing can be more admirably patriotic and disinterested than the zeal which Mr. J. Macdonald evinces, having taken due pains to prevent insurrection on his own estates, to

* Despatches, No. 28.

lead on the brave militia to attack the estates of his neighbours ; nothing more amiable than his anxiety that martial law might be proclaimed without a moment's delay, to authorize his *vigorous* proceedings against the less fortunate slaves of less ' kind ' and considerate proprietors. So eager is he to display his vigour and martial prowess, that, as we have seen, he cannot refrain from expressing his high dissatisfaction at the ' most extraordinary ' conduct of the Commander-in-chief, in directing that the riot act should be read, before the troops fired upon the poor negroes *. ' I would recommend to his Lordship ', says this gentleman, in a letter dated Dec. 28†, ' to proclaim martial law without a moment's delay, and in the mean time, to send down written orders ' to act with the utmost energy. If I, or the colonel of the regiment, had authority to act, the plan I would propose, is, to ' assemble the whole of *the militia*, and at once *attack the largest estate*, and then proceed to the others as circumstances might direct. His Lordship may depend, I do not in the least ' exaggerate the situation of things : they cannot well *be worse*, ' but *fortunately*, *no blood has been yet shed that I know of*.' ' Our militia ', he moreover says, ' is very weak, and *we have little to expect from the regulars, unless positive orders are sent to them to act*.' This distrust of the regular troops,—the sneer at their being so well paid by the country,—the petulant animadversions on Sir Willoughby's conduct,—and the dissatisfaction expressed at not being authorized to commence the work of slaughter at the head of the *militia*,—are all in entire consistency, and will serve to illustrate some further extracts from the correspondence of Mr. Custos Macdonald.

' Had Colonel Tyler acted in the first instance with the promptitude that I wished him to have done, I do not think that things would have got to such a head in this parish (Falmouth) ; but the *three magistrates* formerly alluded to, persuaded him that I had not sufficient grounds to order a company of militia to York Estate ; but I knew the people we had to deal with better than they did ; and I am convinced that a vigorous act at first, would have intimidated them before they had committed themselves so far as to endanger their lives. My advice to Colonel Cadieu was, to take as few prisoners as possible. Advice, in fact, was the only mode in which I could act, until martial law was proclaimed. I hope his Excellency will be pleased to *pass over* what I consider the improper conduct of the magistrates. The facts are these. The moment I took the deposition on oath of the book-keeper, I issued a warrant against five of the negroes whom he considered as the ringleaders, with orders to send up the constables with a company of militia to have it executed. The great error of these magistrates was, the preventing the militia accompanying the constables, who I was certain could not execute the

* Despatches, No. 3.

† No. 9.

warrant without any assistance, and which I told them the moment I came down to Falmouth, and that they had taken great responsibility upon themselves *in disobeying my orders*: my fears proved correct, and the delinquents escaped. I am sorry the letter they wrote is at Fontabelle; but I consider it my duty to mention their names, viz.—Mr. Lamont, Mr. Dyer, and Mr. George Miller. As I wish minutely to acquaint his Excellency with every circumstance that comes to my knowledge, I must beg leave to state, that *I highly disapprove* of the conduct of Mr. Moulton Barret: it has been stated to me, that *he was seen riding out of town with a Mr. Box, who I had ordered to be taken into custody as one of the incendiary preachers*; under some pretence, he was permitted to quit the Court-house, and by that means made his escape, supposed to Kingston, where I hope he will be taken into custody.' (No. 28.)

Upon the strength of this letter, *Mr. Box was arrested*. Mr. Bullock writes in reply:—

' Sir,—In consequence of the information contained in your letter of the 4th instant, I have to inform you, that Mr. Box has been arrested; and *although your letter does not state the charge preferred against him, his Excellency considers it quite sufficient to cause him to be detained, until he may hear further from you*: you will therefore lose no time in transmitting to me such information as you have obtained; when, if the charges appear sufficient, he will be conveyed to Falmouth to abide his trial.

' The lamentable crisis which has now arrived, renders example necessary, however abhorrent it must be to resort to it; and *if it should appear that Englishmen, men of sense and education, have been wicked enough to excite the slaves to rebellion, it cannot be supposed that they shall escape because they are also ministers of religion*. But his Excellency directs me to impress strongly upon your mind, the great discretion which in such a case should be adopted, to endeavour, by every means in your power, to divest tribunals from all feeling of prejudice, and above all, of *prejudice on grounds of religion*; for, in civil commotion, the evil is never so great as when it assumes the appearance of religious war. I have, &c.

(Signed)

' WILLIAM BULLOCK.'

' Hon. James M'Donald.'

(No. 29.)

Of Mr. Box we know nothing, but suppose that he is one of the Wesleyan Missionaries, since his name is not to be found among those connected with the Baptist Missionary Society*. Of his respectability we can entertain no doubt, since Mr. Moulton Barret would hardly have been seen riding out of town with

* Lord Belmore describes him, according to the information he had received, as 'a Missionary from the Baptist Society.' This, at all events, he is not.

him, had he not sustained a reputable character. From the high disapprobation expressed against Mr. Moulton Basset's conduct by Mr. J. M'Donald, we infer, that he actually interposed his protection, and favoured the escape of 'the incendiary preacher;' knowing that Mr. J. M'Donald had ordered him to be taken into custody, and appreciating his motives for doing so. At present, no specific charge is preferred against Mr. Box; but the abusive phrase, 'incendiary preacher,' illustrates another striking feature of these transactions.

6. The whole of the men who were executed, stated, that they had been told by white people for a long time past, that they were to be free at Christmas; and by these same white people, the plan of insurrection had been arranged. Who these white people were, who have, as Lord Belmore remarks, so much to answer for, we are left to surmise. There is an evident reserve upon this point: hints are thrown out, but nothing more specific can be gathered from the documents, than that some 'ministers of religion' are supposed to have been wicked enough to excite the slaves to rebellion. Mr. Box, however, was selected by Mr. J. M'Donald as one of the 'incendiary preachers,' of whom he wished to make an example; and but for his 'escape,' he would probably have experienced the effects of martial law. Lord Belmore's language warrants this suspicion.

'I am as yet unacquainted with the charge on which orders were issued for his apprehension at Falmouth; but the information received from the custos, renders it at all events necessary that he should be for the present detained. *Motives, however, of prudence and humanity caused me to interpose a delay in hurrying him to trial at a moment when so great excitement must necessarily prevail.*

The only other Missionary whose name is mentioned in these documents, is Mr. Burchell, a Baptist Missionary, who, having visited this country for the benefit of his health, had arrived in Montego Bay on the 21st or 22d of December, after an absence of many months, but *had not landed*, or had any intercourse with the negroes, finding the country in a state of insurrection. William Annand, overseer of Ginger-hill plantation, deposes*, that he 'was told by a slave named Susannah Crawford, that she 'heard from Anne Laye, a free person of colour, and a member 'of the Baptist persuasion, that a Mr. Burchell had arrived' in the bay, and 'that he did not intend landing until this affair was 'settled; but had written to his deputies†, that his dearly beloved 'children must not regret his absence, for that he would be to 'them a pillar of iron, and would always be their support;—that

* Despatches, No. 18.
VOL. VII.—N.8.

† His deacons must be here meant.

‘ they must shed no blood, for life was sweet, easy to be taken away, but very hard to give.’ This deposition requires no comment. Though evidently given with malignant design, the statement does honour alike to Mr. Burchell’s prudence and his humanity ; for it is evident, from even this garbled hearsay report, that the letter he wrote, was intended to restrain the insurgents from bloodshed. At the same time, his absence from the country must protect him from the charge of having misled or excited the negroes. Of Mr. Burchell, we happen to have some personal knowledge, and can answer for his purity of motive and his discretion.

No other white person is mentioned in the official documents ; but a paragraph has appeared in the Jamaica Courant, stating, that three of the Baptist Missionaries residing in the disturbed district, have been apprehended as instigators of insurrection and revolt ; namely, Messrs. Knibb, Whitehorne, and Abbott. Mr. Knibb is a highly respectable Baptist Missionary stationed at Falmouth ; and he may have fallen into the hands of the Hon. J. M’Donald, Custos of Trelawny. A very short letter has been received from him in this country, dated the 27th of December, in which he apologises for brevity, by stating, that he was ‘ wearied ‘ in trying to quell an insurrection in the parish.’ As, however, the apprehension of Mr. Knibb and his brethren stands in need of confirmation, we shall not waste any words in the attempt to shew the utter incredibility of their being chargeable with encouraging insubordination and revolt ; but shall simply transcribe a sentence from the letter of Mr. Dyer, the Secretary to the Baptist Missionary Society, addressed to the Editor of the Patriot, in reference to the paragraph from the Jamaica Courant, which has been going the round of the London newspapers. ‘ I have ‘ yet to learn what possible motive can be supposed to influence ‘ men all at once to falsify the whole current of their lives, and ‘ gratuitously to consign themselves to ruin and disgrace ; for I ‘ presume that no one imagines that the Society by which they ‘ are supported, would for a moment allow political incendiaries to ‘ retain connexion with it.’

That there are men in Jamaica, however, who would not grudge the cost of a *manageable* insurrection to get up a case against the Missionaries, and to have a pretext for bringing them under the operation of martial law,—that same martial law under which Mr. Smith of Demerara was condemned to death by his legislative murderers,—will not appear absolutely incredible to those who are acquainted with the provisions of the Act which passed the Jamaica House of Assembly as recently as 1826, and was prevented from becoming law, only by being *disallowed* by the Crown. Upon this subject, the last Number of the Anti-Slavery Reporter contains some instructive information. After an able

analysis of the New Slave Code,—the latest specimen of Jamaica justice, humanity, and civilization, the Writer continues.

‘ Before we close this article, there is one circumstance to which we think it incumbent upon us again to call the special attention of our readers. We have already informed them, that, from the present Act, that of 1831, the persecuting clauses against the Methodists and other Sectaries, and against slaves instructing their fellows, or contributing their money for religious objects, have been excluded. These clauses had stood in the former disallowed Act of 1826, and in the other disallowed Acts which succeeded it. In that of 1826, those clauses are numbered 85, 86, and 87; and they are singularly placed between two clauses, 84 and 89, one of which condemned to death the professors, and the other the practisers of the Obeah superstition. Exactly between these two clauses, the Jamaica legislature had contrived to thrust the three persecuting clauses which they so fondly cherished, and to which they have so tenaciously clung. The first of them (§. 85) denounces the practice of slaves attempting to teach or instruct other slaves, as of “pernicious consequence,” and as even producing risk to life; and punishes the offence by whipping and imprisonment to hard labour in the workhouse. The second (§. 86) denounces all religious meetings of dissenters as dangerous to the public peace, and injurious to the health of the slaves, if held after dusk; and imposes on all teachers holding any such meetings between sunset and sunrise, a fine of from 20*l.* to 50*l.* The third (§. 85) makes it highly penal for any dissenting minister or teacher to receive any money from slaves, in the way of contribution for religious or other purposes; it being alleged, in the preamble to the clause, “that large sums of money and other chattels had been extorted by designing men, professing to be teachers of religion, practising on the ignorance and superstition of the negroes, to their great loss and impoverishment.”

‘ It seems, therefore, fair to inquire, what could have induced the legislators of Jamaica, even if they saw it right to frame and pass such iniquitous clauses as these at all, to choose deliberately to place them in the midst of the criminal part of the code, bristling as it does with all sorts of enormities, and especially to connect them by more immediate juxtaposition, and interfusion, with the *capital* crimes of the *profession* and the *practice* of OBEAH? It may have been, and probably was, their intention to intimate thereby their own opinion, that the Methodist and other dissenting missionaries had found only their proper place, in the scale of moral turpitude, among murderers and felons, and would deservedly also share (had they so dared to enact) the murderer’s and felon’s doom of death or transportation. Or they might have wished to intimate that the pernicious lessons these missionaries conveyed to the slaves,—the Christianity professed and taught by these sectaries—were on a level with the dark superstitions of the Obeah and Myal men and women. Satanic as such a purpose would be, yet, how, by any possibility, without some such intent, could the particular position for the insertion of these persecuting clauses have been so very curiously and aptly selected, by the Jamaica lawgivers of 1826, as inevitably to produce the impression in question? We would not willingly

impute to them so flagitious a design ; and yet, let any man cast his eye at the Act of 1826, and calmly consider the order in which the clauses from 84 to 90 follow each other, and then say whether it be possible to escape from the inference we have ventured to draw from it. And are these men to be still intrusted with the work of legislation ? The guilt, however, is not theirs alone, but ours also, if we go on to tolerate such abominations ;—if, among all our other sins, we continue obstinately to cling to such a system of crime, as has now been laid bare to the eye of the national conscience. When we recollect also *the fabricated, and suborned, and garbled testimony by which the House of Assembly of that day, endeavoured to support their nefarious project of crushing or expelling Christian missionaries from the island of Jamaica*, (see vol. iii. No. 50, p. 24, and No. 55, p. 162,) what can we conclude, but that the whole of the allegations contained in the preamble to the persecuting clauses of the Act of 1826, were deliberate falsifications of fact ?

We take from the same Number, the following extracts from a periodical Work published in Jamaica, under the title of ‘The Christian Record.’

“It has often”, say the Editors, “been a matter of surprise and deep regret to us, to observe the carelessness and criminal unconcern with which the proprietors of estates commit their slaves, body and soul, into the power of persons, as their representatives in this country, who are totally unfit for such a charge. They cannot imagine that they are not responsible for the religious instruction, as well as for the temporal well-being of their slaves ; and that they will not be called on hereafter to give a strict account of the spiritual advantages which they have afforded them. With what consistency, then, can a religious proprietor, in common with all others, commit his estates to a man whom he knows to be grossly *immoral*, and therefore of necessity, *irreligious* ? Every proprietor must be presumed to have some acquaintance with his attorney, and with so much of his character as the attorney takes no pains to conceal. At least, he cannot *know* or *believe* him to be a Christian man ; and yet, he abandons the slave’s spiritual, as well as temporal welfare *wholly* to his care ! What does he expect will be the conduct of such a man ? Does he imagine that he will teach the slaves to condemn and abhor himself ? or that he will allow others—the ministers of religion for instance,—to teach this to the slaves, *if he can prevent it* ? So sinful are the lives of the *majority* of attorneys in this country, and so little trouble do they take to conceal their vices from public view, that the faithful minister of religion is compelled, by every obligation of duty, publicly to warn others from following their example ; and when, *as is the case every day*, the slaves refer to the example of their managers in exculpation of themselves, it becomes his imperative duty to expose the sinfulness of these men, and, it necessarily follows, to hold them up as objects of disgust and pity—a feeling which we know is too frequently mingled with contempt. Now, will these men permit this to go on, if they can prevent it ? Will they not endeavour to obstruct the acquisition of such know-

ledge by the slave, and to counteract, by all means in their power, the influence and usefulness of the minister? Should any one be inclined to doubt upon this subject, we now, on our personal knowledge, declare the fact to him. We tell proprietors at home—Christian Proprietors—that their representatives do, by every means, and especially by secret and covert influence, endeavour to check the spread of *true* religion among their slaves, and to render nugatory the efforts of the minister to enforce the *moral* observance and the *spiritual* doctrines of the Gospel. This, we declare to be the conduct commonly pursued by the great *majority* of the white people on estates in Jamaica. And this their opposition arises, not only from the general hatred which an irreligious man always evinces to spiritual truth, but also from more immediate and obvious causes. Can it be supposed that an attorney, or overseer, who is living in adulterous intercourse with one of the slaves of the property on which he resides, (or with one whom he has hired or bought elsewhere, for the purpose !!) will render facilities to a clergyman to enforce the obligations of the Seventh Commandment on that property? Will he not rather “prevent the meddling hypocrite from interfering in his private concerns?”—with his private *property*? Such is the conduct which would in general be expected from such men; and such is the course which we personally know to be frequently pursued.”

“In further illustration of the feeling of the planters towards the teachers of religion, we select from the writer we have already quoted, the following sentence. ‘They (the benevolent and pious) greatly err, if they suppose the Colonists inimical to the object they have in view, however much they may occasionally have been irritated by the conduct of Anti-Slavery Missionaries.’—Now what does Mr. Barclay mean by Anti-Slavery Missionaries? Does the Anti-Slavery Society send Missionaries to Jamaica? No. Are the Missionaries in Jamaica sent here for the purpose of secretly promoting the supposed objects of the Anti-Slavery Society? No man of *sense* thinks this: no man who observes their conduct impartially will credit it. Then why are they called ‘Anti-Slavery Missionaries?’ Because they have taught true Christianity; and having been persecuted by the Planters for so doing, they have very naturally appealed for protection to their friends ‘at home’, and the Anti-Slavery Society have taken up their complaint. This feeling of irritation and hostility is not evinced to the ‘Sectarians’ alone. It is true that the clergy of the Establishment did, for a long time, escape this *serious* accusation; and we must add, that we fear they escaped the charge, because they sacrificed *duty* to *conciliation*. But what is the fact now, since latterly a few of them have come forward to stem the torrent of false religion? Why they too have been assailed by the very same outcry! They too have been denounced as ‘tools of the Anti-Slavery Society!!!’ In short, Evangelical, Sectarian, Anti-Slavery, and seditious, are synonymous in Jamaica.”

With regard to the late insurrection, nothing is more clear from the official documents, than that religion had nothing to do with it. The slaves (or, to use a term still more reproachful

in Jamaica, the *negroes*) revolted under the mistaken idea that their freedom-order had actually arrived, and that the planters had no longer a right to detain them in bondage. How they came by this notion, we cannot pretend to say. The emancipation of the Crown slaves might, if known, have strengthened the impression. The result is, a determination on their part, which is no secret, 'not to work after New Year's Day, without being made 'free.' This 'appears to have been made known on almost all 'the estates.' But no overseer, attorney, or magistrate thinks it necessary to inform the Executive Government of this general determination. No complaint or alarm reaches the Governor's ear, although he had expressly begged to be informed, should any erroneous impressions of the design of his Majesty's Government exist among the slaves. The Governor is kept in the dark; and he is advised to withhold his Majesty's proclamation, which would have removed any such erroneous impression:—we were going to say, treacherously advised; for we cannot conceive that Earl Belmore would, of his own accord and judgement, have incurred the responsibility of keeping back so important a document. In the mean time, New Year's Day approaches, and not a step is taken to undeceive the negroes, or to avert the anticipated *strike*. But, a short time before the insurrection, the planters put forth an 'ambiguous declaration,' half complaint, half menace, directed, as it should seem, against the British Government, or the advisers of the Crown. Might they not imagine that a little insurrection would frighten our Government,—or move its compassion towards the much injured planters? The burning of a few trash-houses would not be a great matter; and martial law would soon restore order. So contemptible does the insurrection appear, that Mr. J. M'Donald talks of suppressing it at once, if he might be allowed to put himself at the head of the militia, even without the regular force. It is known (Dec. 26*), that though the negroes were determined to strike work at Christmas, they had agreed that no slaughter was to be committed, unless any of their comrades were killed. Indeed, Mr. Custos M'Donald, in the letter in which he tells the Governor, that the situation of things, *not to exaggerate*, cannot be worse, says, 'No blood has been 'shed.' No bloodshed was contemplated by these poor negroes, and the planters knew it; knew it when they invoked martial law, and burned with zeal to attack the rebel armies of 20, 40, and 200 men, most of them unarmed†. They could have no

* See Despatches, No. 7.

† See Col. Grignon's Letter, No. 23. 'About seven o'clock the rebels advanced upon us in *four columns*. The first body moved upon the trash-houses... this division consisted of about 40 men. One body of *the enemy*, who attacked by the main road, could not have

fear for the issue, as regarded their personal safety, correctly estimating both the force and the disposition of these poor slaves. They ran small risk, therefore, in deliberately allowing 'Daddy Ruler Sharp, director of the whole,' to gain over as many followers as he could. But, whatever they feared or hoped for, they did, in fact, deliberately suffer the expected *strike* on the part of the negroes to take place, which they have converted, by a little poetic colouring, into a notable rebellion. And now, could they but succeed in making the Baptist Missionaries answerable for the whole, and in hanging a few of them as incendiaries, we make no doubt that this consummation, added to the military glory of dispersing the rebel armies, would be deemed an ample compensation for all the mischief which has been effected *.

Our readers are aware, that the insurrection was already at an end, at the date of Lord Belmore's despatch. By the 5th of January, tranquillity had been restored, and the poor negroes were coming in from all directions, anxious to avail themselves of the promise of pardon offered in Sir Willoughby Cotton's proclamation. Proprietors and attorneys were returning to their estates. Every where, Sir Willoughby's presence seems to have wrought like a charm on the minds of 'the insurgents', not from the terror, but from the *confidence* it inspired. It is evident, that the slaves look to the Sovereign and Government of this country for protection, for all they have to hope for. Shall they look to Great Britain in vain? No: this insurrection only supplies one more fatal illustration of the impolicy, injustice, costliness, and wickedness of slavery. What, after all, did these insurgent negroes strike for? *THEIR PERSONAL FREEDOM*, to which, if there be such a thing as a natural right, inalienable but by criminal forfeiture, they have as valid a right in Jamaica, as they would have in England; and if a right at all, an immediate right, incapable of becoming stronger. And although the principles of Christianity clearly enjoin submission to constituted authorities and existing institutions, notwithstanding these may involve personal wrongs; teaching the slave to be subject and faithful to his master, till he can lawfully obtain his freedom, and discountenancing all insurrection and revolt; still, the claims of the injured to redress are not invalidated by either their submission or their

consisted of less than 200 men: the numbers in the other divisions, I could not judge of, as they were *covered by a stone wall fence* and the Hill-house; but both divisions *appeared* to have *many* fire-arms!!'

* We are aware of the extreme illiberality of suspecting Jamaica planters to be capable of all this: the supposition would require no proof, if it related to Baptist ministers or other evangelical sectarians.

helplessness, nor do the wrongs of the oppressed cease to be wrongs, because perpetuated by the forms of legislation. If there is such a thing as a social wrong, personal slavery is emphatically the greatest of wrongs; and injustice, which is always impolicy, is sure to entail upon its perpetrators retribution with interest. Slavery must cease.

Art. V. *Of Pestilential Cholera; its Nature, Prevention, and Curative Treatment.* By James Copland, M.D. &c. &c. 12mo. pp. 175. London, 1831.

“**T**HE pestilence that walketh in darkness.” Than this scriptural quotation, we cannot imagine any thing more strikingly appropriate as a commencement of the disquisition now to be engaged in. While chemistry has unfolded many particulars of interest respecting the constitution of the atmosphere, and particulars which are not without useful bearing upon medical researches; while physiology has added to the number of its facts, and to the mode of applying those facts to the therapeutic art; while pathology has been advancing in simplicity and truth, and the materia medica has furnished new agents of great efficacy in meeting the exigencies of pain and suffering; scarcely a single step has been advanced towards solving the great problem of contagion; and medical men of the most enlightened understanding and enlarged acquirements are, to this very hour, disputing on what would seem, as an abstract question, scarcely a disputable one, viz., In what manner are pestilential maladies received and transmitted?

That this is verily the state of things, our recent controversies on cholera are sufficient proofs. Even the word generally employed to express the aggregate of symptoms characterizing the present epidemic, while it has been received as legitimate by some, is severely objected to by others. Admit all you say and all you think respecting this same cholera, it is, after all, fever, rather than cholera, about which you are disputing; and it ought to be investigated and treated as fever. Such, in some measure, is the language of the very sensible and erudite treatise placed at the head of the present article; and such is the doctrine advanced, and the language employed by many of our orators in the debating societies among which we have recently mixed.

That the above sentiments are the sentiments of Dr. Copland, is not, however, the reason for our selection of his tract. The fact is, that were we to transcribe the whole, or even the larger number of title-pages to works and pamphlets having the discussion on cholera as their avowed object, we should present more

preface than discussion to our readers, and might fill great part of our monthly number with title-pages alone.

Our main objects in this article, are, to offer a few brief remarks on the subject of pestilence; and the bearing of its laws upon the complaint now prevalent;—to treat on the pathological circumstances characterizing Cholera, the modes of its prevention and management, and the question of its probable spread among us in a severe and malignant form. It is hardly necessary to say, that our brief disquisition will bear upon the point principally in dispute, whether the disease called Cholera is specifically the same in all its advents and localities.

If it be objected against us, that our pages ought not to be made the arena of medical controversy,—that ephemeral and passing matters are beneath our concern,—and that papers have before appeared in the Eclectic Review on the disorder named Cholera,—the universality of interest which is now attached to the malady, must be received as an apology for our thus again adverting to it.

In looking over the works of antient authors, it is surprising how little we find of information, or even of intimation, on the question of contagion or infection. Indeed, the historians and poets are, strange to say, more full in their animadversions on pestilence, than the strictly medical writers; but even these never seem to have entertained any notion of the communicable nature of distemper, beyond the fact, that, in certain localities and circumstances, where men and beasts have been congregated together,—there, a widely devastating disorder has broken out, and affected in common the human and brute creation.

Πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἀϊδὶ προΐαψεν
Ἡρώων, αὐτοὺς δ' ἐλώρια τέϋχε ΚΥΝΕΣΣΙΝ,
ΟΙΩΝΟΙΣΙ ΤΕ ΠΑΣΙ·

says Homer, and beyond this, very little more is said by any of the earlier writers; most probably because any thing that was out of the customary course of things, was referred to the particular and immediate interference of Heaven with the concerns of the nether world.

The laws and ordinances of the Hebrews, indeed, are founded upon the principle, that separation of the sick from the sound, was necessary to prevent the spread of some of the more obvious contagions; but we do not meet with any thing more, in the Jewish records, which implies a distinct recognition on the part of the people, that some disorders visit many at the same moment, while others are successively communicated by contact or immediate intercourse with the infected.

Dr. Maclean, who attributes the origin and spread of pestilential affections exclusively to a certain condition of the atmosphere,

and ridicules the notion of communicability by contact, asserts, that the idea of contagion, as now received, was never thought of, till it became an object with the Roman see to translate the Council of Trent to Bologna, which was effected by persuading the Fathers of that council, that a *contagious* epidemic prevailed at Trent. There does not seem, however, satisfactory ground for accepting this explanation, for the very announcement of the source of danger, implied a previous conception, that sickness might thus pass from one to another in consequence of contact or immediate vicinity. And although Hippocrates, in the whole of his "epidemics", does not distinctly refer to this mode of a disorder's conveyance, yet, there are some intimations in Thucydides, in his account of the Athenian Plague, which, though not strictly and directly to the point, and though mixed with the principles and feelings just adverted to, would seem to indicate that he did not more especially allude to it, because he took it for granted as universally received.

But our time and space will not admit, nor perhaps does the present occasion demand, that we should go more minutely into this discussion: sufficient is it that we take for granted the fact of some diseases being at once regulated, as to their continuance and their spread, both by contagious and by infectious principles; that is, they seem to have some dependence upon the atmosphere, and some upon individual communication;—in other words, they are at the same time infectious and contagious.

Now, how does all this apply to Cholera? That a disease has for a long time prevailed in the East with such dread malignity as to mow down, we had almost said, millions of inhabitants, in travelling a long tract of country, is a matter of historical truth. That from the East a disease took its course through Persia to the Asiatic side of Russia, and that it made its way through parts of the last-mentioned empire into Poland, visiting several northern provinces, and penetrating to Hamburgh, is likewise generally admitted; whence, according to some, it extended itself to our shores, and is at present prevailing in our country.

Against this last supposition, many set their opinions in battle array. The disorder, first in Asia, and then in the North of Europe, had been, according to your own shewing, (argue the non-importation men,) a coasting or continental affair. It had not travelled across any sea, nor is it at all likely it would do so, since a mixture of contagion and atmospheric poison is assumed as necessary to its preservation and propagation; and because the combination of these two requisites cannot be conceived to take place when vessels with goods and individuals traverse large tracts of water. Is it not a known fact, too, they ask, that during the prevalence of the most virulent form of Cholera in India, the naval communication between every part of

the East and this country has been free and unrestricted? But, if the transportation across the seas by bales of goods and affected individuals be capable of carrying infection one or two hundred miles, it would, by the same laws, one or two thousand. Again, a degree at least of the same distemper that you now talk of as an imported one, had been epidemic in this country for very many months before this alleged transference; and although the northern visitations were principally, at first, confined to the coast and to parts near the shore, the instances of Cholera which are now, according to the representations of contagionists, principally along the banks of the Thames, are not only on the wrong side of the river to harmonize with the notions of debarking, but in distant parts of the town: here and there, a case of malignant Cholera, without any likely or traceable communication, makes its tremendous attack.

The season too, the anti-contagionist, or rather anti-importationist argues, has been such as is likely to be productive of stomach, and bilious, and spasmodic, and febrile derangement; and what the other party chooses to call Asiatic Cholera, is nothing more or less than a particular modification of fever with arrested secretions, and sympathetic cramps, and congestions of blood. That the low damp districts near the Thames have been its principal London localities, is plainly ascribable to the influence of humidity and stagnant moisture, as assisting causes, with the pestilential condition of the atmosphere generally; and, (continue the advocates of this side of the question,) your cases are, in point of number, by much "too few and far between" to justify the contagious inference; and more than half even of these few are probably caused by the alarm excited by your own sagacious, (some go the length of saying, but they have no right to go such lengths,) your own interested enactments.

When these *pros* and *cons* are considered together without party bias or prepossession, we cannot wonder that a considerable measure of uncertainty and apprehension is excited in the mind,—and that the "differing of doctors" produces painful indecision on the part of the people. For ourselves, however, we may say, without wishing absolutely to commit ourselves on either side, that we do not join with those who are very full of alarms and apprehensions respecting our present or coming condition. The sources of our hope are taken principally from the following considerations.

Even in those districts where the malignant disorder has been stated to prevail, commencing with Sunderland and reaching to Edinburgh,—an exceedingly inconsiderable proportion of the populace have become sufferers; and when disease has suddenly attacked, and death rapidly succeeded, the victims have, with but very little exception indeed, been guilty of imprudences and irre-

gularities with respect to diet and habits of life,—have been those who are proverbially careless as to coming danger, and who superstitiously quail when the danger comes,—or such as are too much shut up against the wholesomeness of ventilation, and whose frames are made especially vulnerable to the shafts of disease, by the habit of substituting exciting spirits and vapid materials of sustenance for substantial and wholesome food.

Secondly, were the disorder strictly a contagion, and not referrible to the state of the circumambient air, we should not have had, as it is admitted on all hands we have had, affections allied to, if not a degree of, the same disorder for more than half a year previously to the present—as maintained by the contagionists—*new* disorder. It is, indeed, one of the laws of pestilence, that both before and after its *acmè*, minor measures of distemper are frequent, so that we may not yet have seen the worst; but if worse is still pending, we take comfort from the power of preventive measures, and from the great improvement in the medical polity of this great nation.

Thirdly. A well founded confidence and an unpresumptuous hope are allowed by all to be great securities against much more of distemper than we hitherto have had, or are even likely ever to have; and we verily believe that the most strenuous contagionist is not able to adduce a single instance of what he would consider as malignant cholera, where the individual has been in precisely the same state in which he ought to have been, even without reference to the fear of disease.

We now proceed to a very cursory statement of what appear to us to be the constituents of Cholera; and to put the question generally to the good sense of some of the profession, whether there may not have been a little too much of confounding degree with kind, and, if we may so say, quantity with quality of disease? This question, we shall submit very briefly and very respectfully, as we do not desire the ascription of partizanship, and would prefer, in the present instance at least, that our readers should infer from our data, rather than defer to our dicta.

Cholera is said to be bilious or spasmodic; the first characterized chiefly by an inordinate secretion of bile, that bile also being acrimonious; the other more properly marked by spasms and locked up secretions. In either case, there is for the most part, and almost necessarily, a primary disorder of the great central mass of nerves at the region of the stomach; this nervous derangement being induced by causes which act more directly or less immediately upon the stomach. Thus, if a patient, after eating a hearty meal of indigestible matter, becomes cramped in his stomach, and cramped in his muscles, and cramped in the organs which perform the offices of secretion, we should say, that the exciting source of the malady was indigestion; whereas, if the brain,

from alarm, or if the skin, from exposure to damp and cold, or the nervous system generally, from the several sources which exhaust nervous energy, were the first points of attack, we should consider these as the exciting causes, and indigestion, with failing secretion and assimilation, the immediate consequences; and this would apply either to the bilious or the spasmodic kind of derangement. The blueness of the skin, and other signs of irregular circulation, are plainly traceable to the lungs partaking of the general commotion or morbid quiescence, and to the want of due oxygenation or due decarbonization of the general mass of blood. In fact, the course, as Mr. Searle has stated in his pamphlet, is greatly analogous to the circumstances of malignant fever in general, which, if it do not destroy the vital principle in its first attack, sets up all these irregularities in the circulating and secreting and sentient organs. When bile, instead of being locked up, is poured forth in abundance, spasms throughout the frame are occasional concomitants; but the resulting disorder does not mount up to such a malignant height, partly because the flow of bile is in some measure a cure of the complaint, or rather, it is one of the main links in the chain of processes which nature endeavours to establish for the expulsion of the morbid visitation.

But surely, whether the secretions be suddenly and forcibly arrested, or whether they flow out in more than ordinary abundance, it does not necessarily follow, that the malady, in the one and in the other case, is of varied kind. We would ask, what is meant by a *different* disorder—by the spasmodic and bilious division—by mild and malignant malady—by English and Asiatic Cholera? Do the employers of the terms intend to announce, that the predisposition and excitants are different? Then we are willing to go with them to the full length of their assumptions and inferences; for neither the same disposing nor exciting causes can by any possibility exist in our latitudes and with our temperature; and the disease (Asiatic Cholera) can no more exist here, than can the yellow fever be conveyed from a West India island to the British isles. Here, indeed, we may have bilious fevers in considerable number, and rising up to much individual intensity; but it is impossible that the endemic of the transatlantic shores can ever become endemic with us, inasmuch as the exterior circumstances and internal susceptibilities are not present.

But we are prevented from pursuing this subject; and we hasten to say a very few words on the treatment of Cholera; a very few words, because we think that general principles are here, as in other cases of disease, quite incapable of abstract or undeviating application; every fresh case being, as the artists say, a fresh study; and because we think, that the expediency of

this or that measure must be gathered from general principles of pathology, rather than from literary or even oral instruction.

The great leading principles are, however, to dissolve spasm, thereby to restore the secretions, and to bring about a healthy influx of nervous power, and a freedom in the blood's circulation. The first indication may be fulfilled by strong emetics, as mustard-seed flower in large quantities, or sulphate of zinc; or it may be assisted by drawing blood from a vein, or by the administration of drastic purges; but we sometimes meet with cases where the primary collapse is so extreme, and in others where the pain is so excessive, that stimulants and opium, and warm or rather hot fomentations and bathing are immediately demanded, or life will succumb to the first shock. The sooner, however, that the alvine secretion be restored, the better: indeed, when, in the spasmodic form of the disease, the discharges, from being white and ricey, or dark, as if blood were broken down and passed by the bowels, become truly faecal, the malady may be regarded as having been got very considerably under, and the remaining symptoms will be watched over and met according to their number and force. In the general way, however, no continued commotion is set up, and this attack leaves the person in as full health as it found him. We ourselves heard the anecdote that was a few days since recorded in the public papers; viz. a physician, having heard that some Cholera cases had just broken out in a dirty alley at the east end of the town, lost no time in repairing thither, and, upon his asking about these cases of a woman who was just coming out of the court as the doctor was entering it, she replied, "I am one of them, Sir."

In respect to preventives, to say much, were but to reiterate what we meet with in every newspaper, and magazine, and Cholera bill of the day. Confidence and regular habits, warm clothing, especially of the feet, the careful avoidance of damp places, generous but not luxurious living in the way of diet, are the great preservatives against complaints of the stomach and bowels. All indigestible articles of food ought, under the present circumstances of epidemic susceptibility, to be more especially refrained from. Pork is proverbially bad. Veal to some stomachs is still worse. All dessert articles are noxious. Oranges are a bilious, rather than antibilious fruit. Pickles are especially unwholesome. Violence of temper should be bridled, and every source of mental agitation shunned. A good friction, every morning, of the whole surface of the body is desirable. At all times the cutaneous vessels ought to be kept free from obstruction by ablution and friction, but more especially so when stomach disorders are prevalent, on account of the great sympathy and connexion with the condition of the skin and the state of the alimentary passages. When stomach

affections threaten, lose no time in taking about half a fluid ounce (a table-spoonful) of tincture of rhubarb mixed with a tea-spoonful of common magnesia, or a third of the quantity of carbonate of soda in a glass of water, or, what would be much better, simple peppermint water. Should much pain attend a stomach attack, and that be in the night, or at a time and place when medical assistance could not promptly be procured, let the tincture of rhubarb be taken without the magnesia, and five and twenty drops of tincture of opium be added. Further than these directions, we dare not go; indeed, we have already trespassed somewhat beyond the lawful province of Reviewers; but the circumstances are such as we have thought might justify a trifling departure from critical regularity and dignity.

Our readers will have perceived that we do not rank with "Alarmists." At the same time, caution, if it be unaccompanied by mistrust, can never be considered as superfluous. It is to carelessness in the first place, and then to superstitious fears and wonderments succeeding, that we are in a very great measure, as previously intimated, to attribute the run of Cholera through the pauper districts in which it may first appear.

Before we conclude, we must again say, that very much still remains mysterious, both in reference to the northern cause of the Eastern disease, and as it respects infection generally. Does the atmosphere convey the seeds of distemper from district to district? How does it happen that a particular course is chosen for the transmission? And how is it to be explained, that air, which one should suppose would have its particles freely and constantly interchanging, is in one spot laden with distemperring miasm, in another quite free from such poison? All Eastern travellers know, that the Levant plague prevails in one spot, while a near one is totally exempt; and this without any discovered peculiarities, or differences of latitude, or even contiguity, to explain the circumstance. The Roman Malaria is said to infest one side of a street, and to leave the other side untouched; yet, let the chemist subject the atmospheres of the two contiguous localities to every trial his science is capable of effecting, he will find not the smallest difference in their apparent constituents. All the varied hypotheses that have been proposed in order to account for infectious conditions of the air, such as intestine commotions and consequent chemical and meteoric changes, entirely fail of their intended purpose; and untenable as the notion may be, we can find none less so, than that the materials of pestilence are, as some have suggested, the larvæ of myriads of insects, which descend as they traverse districts, and thus blast and blight the vegetable creation, while they bring disease and death upon man, and bird, and beast.

- Art. VI.—1. *Trinitarian Bible Society.* A Letter addressed to the Editor of "The Record" Newspaper, on the Proceedings at the Formation of the above Institution, as reported by Him. With a Postscript, referring to the Speeches on the same subject, at the Westminster Auxiliary Trinitarian Bible Society. By the Rev. John Scott, M.A. Hull. Second Edition. 8vo. pp. 16. Price 3d. London, 1832.
2. *The Comparative Claims of the British and Foreign Bible Society and the Trinitarian Bible Society calmly discussed.* By the Rev. John King, M.A. Minister of Christ Church, Hull. 8vo. pp. 36. Price 1s. Hull, 1832.
3. *An Examination of certain Passages of Scripture,* which have been appealed to by some late Friends of the British and Foreign Bible Society, in Justification of their Separation from that Institution. By John Bacon, Esq. F.A.S. President of the Axminster Branch Bible Society. 8vo. pp. 40. Price 1s. London, 1832.
4. *Two Letters addressed to a Friend in Wales,* on some prevalent Misconceptions relative to the Constitution and Proceedings of the British and Foreign Bible Society. By C. S. Dudley. 8vo. pp. 18. Price 6d. London, 1832.

IT is not a little remarkable that, among the factions which divided the primitive Church at Corinth, there was one which professed to have Christ for its peculiar head. While not less animated by a sectarian spirit, than those who professed to follow Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, these Christians *par excellence* affected a peculiar and exclusive attachment to the common Lord and Head of the Church, as the patron of their party; and each member, priding himself upon the arrogant assumption, exclaimed, 'I am of Christ.' So far from praising these exclusives for thus apparently disclaiming all inferior authority, the Apostle classes them with the other dividers of Christ; with good reason, since to use the name of the Divine Lord of the Church as the designation of a party, is more directly to 'divide Christ,' than to prefer Paul to Peter, or Calvin to Luther, among his apostles and servants. Nay, it is to derogate from the honour of their common Lord, as well as to impeach the fidelity of those who are not less truly His disciples, because they may class with the followers of a particular teacher. It is, in fact, so far as in us lies, to reduce the Master to a level with his servants.

It is easy to perceive this to be the effect of the use made of our Lord's name by the Papists. In the Romish hagiology, Christ appears but as one of an army of saints, the patron of an order, of a town, of a church, having his festival-day in the calendar, just as any other saint. And strange to say, of all the Romish orders, the most Anti-Christian is that which

has assumed the name of Jesus. Only custom reconciles us to the gross impropriety of a similar mode of using the holy name as one of local denomination in our own country. Who that was not better informed would imagine that St. Saviour, St. Luke, St. Sepulchre, and St. Bennet, each of whom has his church in the metropolis, were any other than good Romish saints? Then we have Christ's Hospital and St. Bartholomew's; Christ Church and St. Mary's; Trinity College and St. John's. If it be right to use the thrice holy name of the Deity and the blessed name of Our Lord in this way, it must at least be wrong to use the names of either apostles or apocryphal saints in the same way. No one, indeed, imagines that Christ's Church or St. Saviour's is a more holy edifice, or that its founders were more orthodox, on account of the dedicatory name. No one supposes, that the brethren of the Holy Trinity Company are holier in their life and conversation than those of St. Andrew's Hospital; any more than that Trinity Lane is a more sacred place than Pudding Lane, or Paternoster Row and Creed Lane more religious than Pye Corner. Yet, we must confess that our ears have never been reconciled to this nomenclature, though familiar to us from youth. To dedicate a Christian Church to a saint, strikes us as an impropriety utterly irreconcilable with the Protestant faith, which rejects the invocation of saints; but it is a practice which, though originating in superstition, has become unmeaning. However improper, the practice has not the effect of profaneness. But to use the name of Christ, or of the Holy Trinity, in designating buildings, streets, and parishes, must have a tendency to lessen the reverence for those holy names, and is surely one way of taking God's name in vain.

The same objection may not be thought to apply with equal force to the designating of a religious society by the name of the Deity; although the difference lies more in the intention, than in the effect. The intention may be religious, while the effect is profane. The Trinitarian Bible Society is, even in this point of view, an objectionable designation; not less so than that of the Order of Jesus. Perhaps, '*The Jesuit Bible Society*' would be equally improper, but it would be in some respects a more appropriate designation.

The intention, however, with which this offensive designation has been chosen by those who would thus proclaim, '*We are believers in the Trinity*', is not less exceptionable than the thing itself. It has been adopted for the express purpose of sanctifying a party division. It is in factious opposition to their fellow Christians, that these dividers of the body write upon their phylacteries, '*I am of Christ*'. It is in the spirit of arrogant assumption and uncharitable insinuation, that the distinctive denomination has been chosen; implying that the Bible Society,

from which this is a secession, is characteristically Anti-Trinitarian. One of the leaders of this new faction cautions his friends against calling Socinians Unitarians, because it implies that Trinitarians are not the worshippers exclusively of one God. We have, for our own part, always felt a strong objection to concede to the *soi-disant* Unitarians, their use of the word; not merely because it implies this, but because an unfair advantage has been taken by the Socinians themselves of the seeming concession. We are as truly Unitarians as those who reject the Scriptural revelation of the Godhead subsisting in the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit. And we are as truly Trinitarians as those who assume that name for the purpose of discrediting the orthodoxy of all who differ from them as to the proper constitution of a society for distributing the Holy Scriptures. But if the one denomination be unfair and deceptive, so must be the other. Nor can a more direct sanction be given to the appropriation of the word Unitarian by the Socinians, than is tacitly supplied by the adoption of the word Trinitarian as its opposite, and by the use of the latter word in the same sectarian and unfair way, in order to cast a slur upon those who are not of their party.

That such a designation should have been chosen by the Sackville Street faction, is, however, quite in character with the whole of their proceedings, which are stamped with the correspondent marks of illiberal and deceptive representation, sanctimonious pretension, and profaneness. What would have been said, had a Socinian spoken of the inspired volume in the following language?

‘Much talk there was about the splendour of its (the Bible Society’s) doings; and it might have been supposed that a Millennium was to be manufactured by a certain quantity of paper and sheep-skin.’ * (*Laughter.*)

Such is the language of the Rev. H. Melvill, of the Trinita-

* ‘Is not this despised “sheep-skin” the casket in which the inestimable pearl of Divine Truth is sent to every kindred and nation and tongue and people? Is not this scorned “paper” written with the finger of the Living God? If they who profanely swore by the Temple, virtually swore by Him whose glory filled the Temple, they who hold up to derision the “paper” on which the revelation of God’s will is inscribed, and the “sheep-skin” in which it is preserved, are, in fact, deriding the Revelation itself, and Him who made it. I believe the Rev. Gentleman who gave utterance to this expression—as destitute of taste as it is revolting to piety—said it in “his haste”, and, when he thinks thereon, will weep: but the mischief of such statements, coming from such a quarter, it is not easy to calculate. Surely it is enough for infidels to sneer at the Word of God!’

King’s Comparative Claims, p. 28.

rian Bible Society, in a speech in which he goes so far as to charge the Bible Society with conferring a dignity on heresy, while 'it struck at truth with a sledge-hammer'. What, again, would have been thought of the following expressions, had they appeared in any publication intended to burlesque the evangelical faith?

'Let them go forth in this great undertaking, and leaning, as it were, their backs against the strength of the Lord Jesus, who has grown up, as it were, as a man behind them'. Or, according to the *Corrected Speeches*, 'You must each go forth as single men, and just lean your back, as it were, against the strength of your risen Lord that is behind you.'

Such is a specimen of the highly admired and impressive speech of Mr. Perceval on the same occasion! From the applause and 'laughter' these flowers of rhetoric called forth, our readers may fairly judge of the 'solemnized spirit', the peculiarly devout and chastened sobriety which characterized the first meeting of the Trinitarian Bible Society.

Of the publications before us, it is unnecessary for us to express our cordial approbation. If the controversy could be settled by calm reasoning and forcible statement, the circulation of these pamphlets, and others previously noticed in our pages, would soon bring it to a happy issue. That fresh publications should be deemed necessary, is a circumstance, however, that gives one but a melancholy idea of the internal state of religious society. We could not have conceived it possible that it should have required so long a time, and such an expense of labour, to dissipate the delusion, and to expose the hollowness of this last stratagem of the Enemy. Mr. Bacon has, however, explained the way in which the mischief has become epidemic.

'As I hope to be believed when professing some solicitude in reference to the general spirit and temper which shall be seen to prevail among those who, in more than the ordinary manner, "profess and call themselves Christians,"—and as I see the New Society promoted and patronized to a great extent by those who have at least been closely connected with very bold adventurers in various novelties and imaginations,—I am induced to entreat all our Bible friends to think for themselves; and, in so doing, to lay every consideration connected with the question generally, and with the Scriptures cited on both sides, seriously to heart. And to this request I take the liberty to add one suggestion, which may not be irrelevant in the present day, namely, that too precipitate a conclusion be not drawn from impressions—frequently termed *convictions*—respecting Religious questions and opinions, merely because they have remained on the mind after prayer has been offered for Divine illumination and guidance. Though it be indeed true, that if a man "lack wisdom" and "ask it of God," he shall receive it, yet I am assured, that what has just been alluded

to has been the occasion of many a "dangerous downfall" among sincere persons. It is not in a few instances that I have seen the minds of such, especially young Christians, taken captive by certain pleasing novelties, spiritual discoveries, things "*given of God*," as they have concluded, either to themselves or their teachers. The fact, however, has appeared quite evident, in many instances; namely, that they have already embraced the views and sentiments which are professedly to be inquired into by prayer and reading of God's Word:—they may pray, perhaps sincerely; and they may search, as they hope, in a right spirit; but the preconceived sentiment, having been supposed to possess Divine sanction, and being connected with a consequent fear of resisting what has been, as they cannot but still believe, "*given to them of God*," causes them to seize with avidity every passage they meet with in Scripture which appears to sanction the favourite view, and to pass by, or soften down, all others which militate against it. In this way, I am assured, thousands of pious and sincere young Christians are jointly deluded by the Tempter and by their own unsuspecting hearts. Indeed I may add, that I *know* this to be the case, from *two* circumstances: first, that when I have simply submitted to them the most powerful passages, calculated at least to moderate their views, and set them on a re-examination of the data on which they have been founded, I was told, I was doing nothing less than fighting against God: and, secondly, because some of those very individuals, having at length, *Icarus*-like, soared till they have melted their wings, have, after resuming that path where "*he who walketh uprightly walketh surely*," had the Christian humility to confess to the truth of what I had been suggesting.—And here I cannot lose the opportunity of recording the expression of one amiable individual, who had at one time soared more powerfully and loftily than most others:—"I have done with romance in Religion."

'With innumerable examples of a similar description existing on the right hand and on the left, and viewing, as most conscientiously I do, the new views and opinions taken up respecting the Bible Society, as only a part of the general delusion which prevails principally among the ardent, the susceptible, the adventurous, the flexible, the young, and the unsuspecting, to the serious injury of individuals, and the reproach, not to say disgrace, of Religion itself, I shall hope to obtain credit for a solicitude, not only in behalf of the Bible Society, but for the best interests of my fellow-Christians, and the honour of Him whom it is our common privilege to call "Our Lord and our God."'

Bacon, pp. 37—39.

We have seen no better statement of the question at issue, and of the arguments in support of the principles upon which the British and Foreign Bible Society is founded, than is contained in the '*Hibernian Bible Society's Address*'; it is very concise, lucid, and convincing. Mr. King's examination of the '*Comparative Claims*' of the Bible Society and the new anti-Bible Society association, is a very forcible appeal, written in an excellent spirit, and adapted, we should think, to have a very good effect. Mr. Scott's Letter will serve a most useful purpose, if it

renders the character of the Record Newspaper more generally understood; and Mr. Dudley's Two Letters, a simple statement of facts, will, we hope, operate in some quarters as a mild alternative in cases where prejudice is not virulent.

There is one paragraph in Mr. King's Letter, to which we feel it necessary to advert, before we close this article. Of all the objections brought against the Bible Society, the most disingenuous, perhaps, and the most foolish is, that 'it has imitated the example, and adopted the principle, of those Dissenting denominations who combine with Socinians in the defence and extension of their civil and religious rights.' Referring to this charge, Mr. King waves the question, 'whether the orthodox Dissenter may lawfully enter into such a coalition for the attainment of this end;' but he has endeavoured to shew, what is indeed obvious to any person of common sense, that the two cases are by no means parallel; and that it is possible for the one to be perfectly justifiable, though the other may be quite indefensible. Mr. King gives a fair and correct account of the manner in which, under the denomination of Presbyterians, Socinians have become combined with the orthodox Dissenters in that particular association; but he has not so fairly described the principle of the association in the following paragraph. He is shewing that the two Societies differ in *principle* as well as in practice, inasmuch as one proceeds on the ground of selection, the other on the ground of general comprehension,—a just and important distinction.

'When I say,' he continues, 'that the Red-Cross-Street Society adopt the principle of *selection*, I do not mean that the orthodox Members of that Society had any such predilection for Socinianism, as to fix on the professors of its creed in preference to all others; but I mean, that they associated with a body of men who were from the first tainted with this heresy, and yet made no provision to secure themselves against the growing influence of this fatal leaven. They rather overlooked, than encouraged it. But having *chosen* the body in which Socinianism ultimately prevailed, they still keep up their connexion with that body, and, in their official character, put forth the *imprimatur* of their approbation upon it. Then, again, they not only thus select the Socinian Denomination, but *exclude* every other. Neither the Wesleyan Methodists, nor the Society of Friends, nor any other community of Dissenters, are, or can be admitted, according to the present constitution of the Society. Now this appears to be an honour paid to Socinians; as if they were worthy to be distinguished from all others, and suffered to participate in privileges denied to others. It must be allowed, that, in such a combination, the Socinian is entitled to lift up his head with a good degree of confidence: and, if report speaks truly, he is not backward to vindicate his right, and take the lead in most of the proceedings of Red-Cross-Street Library. He feels like a champion belonging to David's "first three," being honoured with the distinctions of fraternity by the largest and most influential bodies of Dissenters.

'I ask, is not the condition of a Socinian in the Bible Society essentially different from this? He stands among the Members of the Dissenting Union as one favoured and selected, to the exclusion of other Denominations: he stands among Members of the Bible Society merely because *none* are excluded. He comes in with the crowd, because the doors are open to all: he is a guest at the table, only because none are forbidden to sit down.'

We freely admit that the difference is essential, so as to make the attempt to confound the two cases, palpably absurd or dishonest. We will go further, and, in the language of Mr. Robert Hall, concede, that the union between the orthodox and the Socinian Dissenters is 'a most unnatural and preposterous union, and tends, above any thing else, to give an imposing air of importance to the Socinian party, which, but for this coalition, would sink into insignificance. It is odious in the eyes of pious churchmen, and tends to throw a disguise over the real state of the Dissenters, in relation to their religious tenets.'* We should rejoice to have the union discreetly and peacefully dissolved. Still, we must repeat what we have before remarked in reference to this subject; that a union locally confined to the metropolis, to a certain degree accidental and undesigned in its origin, deeply regretted by the majority of those who feel themselves involved in it, and in no way implicating the Independent and Baptist ministers throughout the country, and the bulk of the respective denominations,—cannot, without the most palpable unfairness, be made the ground of a charge against the orthodox Dissenters as a body, even if the local union for the specific object be in itself as unlawful as we concede it to be undesirable. And when the attempt to criminate the evangelical Dissenters on this ground, proceeds from the members and advocates of an Establishment, the majority of whose preachers are as far from being evangelical in their doctrines, as the Socinians are from orthodoxy, yet, who are recognized by their evangelical brethren as ministers of Christ,—a more striking illustration could not be afforded of that blind partiality which our Lord rebukes, when He says: 'And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, and seest not the beam that is in thine own eye?'

It is not correctly stated, that the principle of union in the Red Cross Street Association is one of selection, not of comprehension. Mr. King seems to forget that, at the time of its formation, the Wesleyan Methodists were not in existence; and as a union with the Quakers was out of the question, the Three Denominations then comprehended the whole body of the Dissenters. Not only had the Socinians no existence, at that time, as a deno-

* Hall's Works, Vol. V. p. 568.

mination of Protestant Dissenters,—any more than the numerous Socinians within the Church of England at the present time can be so discriminated,—but all the ministers of the Three Denominations, Presbyterian, Independent, and Baptist, were required by law to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, except the thirty-fourth, thirty-fifth, thirty-sixth, and certain words of the twentieth article. This law continued to be in force till near the close of the last century; and previously to its repeal, every Presbyterian minister was as orthodox as the subscribing of the thirty-five articles and a half could make him. The Trinitarian Society could scarcely have desired a better security.

The Presbyterian-Socinian ministers in the Red Cross Street association form, as is well known, a small minority; but the majority can merely secede. The Library itself, the endowments connected with it, the whole property, are in the hands of the Socinians exclusively, who have succeeded to their Presbyterian ancestors in the trust; and by the terms of the trust, it must, we understand, be vested in individuals of the Presbyterian denomination. Although it was never contemplated by the pious founder, that the property would fall into the hands of Socinians, still, it cannot be claimed by orthodox Dissenters of the other denominations. It ought not, however, to excite surprise, that some reluctance and hesitation should nevertheless have been discovered on their part, to abandon all participation in the benefits of the Institution, and to dissolve a connexion with which have hitherto been identified some important civil advantages. It is well known, that ever since the reign of William and Mary, the Dissenting ministers of the Three Denominations in London have enjoyed the privilege, in common with the London Clergy and the two English universities, of addressing the King upon his throne; a prerogative which has been sorely grudged them by their enemies, and which some ignorant or artful persons have endeavoured to represent as a trivial and empty privilege, but which, we trust, the Dissenters will never be led to undervalue or voluntarily to resign. It is not for them, however, to dictate to the Throne the terms upon which they shall continue to enjoy this honour. They have it not in their power either to exclude Socinians, being Presbyterians, from the privilege common to the three associated denominations, or to approach the Throne in separate bodies. If they have been headed on some occasions by a Socinian minister, the time has been, that a University deputation has been headed by a Socinian chancellor. We admit, that the thing is extremely unseemly and repugnant to our feelings. But the best way of obviating the offence, is not very apparent. Could His Majesty be induced to recognize the evangelical denominations of Dissenters specifically, and to permit the ministers of such denominations, stationed in and near the metropolis, and

jointly associated, to enjoy the liberty heretofore extended to those of the Three Denominations without regard to their particular religious sentiments,—we will venture to predict, that the slender connexion between the orthodox Dissenters and the Socinians, which is so afflicting to pious Churchmen, and more especially grievous to the tender conscience of the Editor of “*The Record*”, would not long survive even the Trinitarian Bible Society.

NOTICES.

Art. VII. *The Christian Pastor visiting his Flock, and the Flock reciprocating their Shepherd's Care.* By John Morison, D.D., Author of “*A Commentary on the Book of Psalms*”, &c. 32mo. pp. 128. Price 1s. 6d. London. 1832.

THIS is, we believe, the fifth of a series of very neat pocket volumes, containing ‘*Counsels*’ and cautions from a Christian Pastor to different classes of his flock, for which the religious public are indebted to Dr. Morison. The substance of this Volume was delivered in the form of a sermon, before an Association of Ministers and Churches, and the Preacher was subsequently requested, by a public vote of the body, to publish it. He has deemed it advisable to throw it into its present form, with a view to increase its circulation; ‘*influenced, he trusts, by a desire to draw the attention of ministers and churches more intently to the subject of pastoral visitation, for the neglect of which vital religion greatly languishes in many of our religious communities.*’ We can cordially recommend the perusal to both pastors and their congregations, and may venture to say, that no one will regret having bestowed eighteen pence on this excellent little manual.

Art. VIII. *A History of the Italian Republics*, being a brief View of the Origin, Progress, and Fall of Italian Freedom. By J. C. L. De Sismondi. In One Volume. (Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopædia, Vol. xxvii.) fcap. 8vo. pp. 378. Price 6s. London, 1832.

DR. LARDNER deserves the best thanks of the public, for having suggested to the accomplished Historian of the Italian Republics, the idea of comprising the interesting story of their origin, progress, and fall, in the compass of a single volume. There was but one individual thoroughly qualified to achieve the task, by long familiarity with the history in all its details, and a distinct apprehension of the relative importance and bearings of the various scenes in the complicated drama. M. Sismondi has given us, not, as he says himself, an abridgement of his great work, (which, in any other hands, the volume would have been,) but an entirely new history, in which, with his ‘*eyes fixed solely on the free people of the several Italian states,*’ he has ‘*studied*

‘ to portray, within a compass which should be compatible with animation and interest, their first deliverance, their heroism, and their ‘ misfortunes.’ Of M. Sismondi’s original work, in sixteen volumes, our critical opinion will be found in the second series of our Journal. Although the present publication is not designed to supersede it, those who are already in possession of the original, will be pleased to be carried more rapidly through the outlines of the history, while, to readers in general, this volume will convey a clearer idea and a stronger impression of the leading events. Compression has evidently been studied to the utmost ; and by no other means could the multifarious mass of information have been comprised within a single volume. A very full and valuable Analytical and Chronological Table prefixed to the History, and a good Index, add not a little to the obligations we are laid under to both Author and Editor.

Art. IX. *The Mythology of Ancient Greece and Italy.* For the Use of Schools. By Thomas Keightley, Author of the “ Outlines of History ” in the Cabinet Cyclopædia, &c. 18mo. pp. 202. Plates. London, 1832.

WE have not seen the Author’s larger work upon the same subject, to which he refers us in the Preface ; but we have been much pleased with this ingenious attempt to furnish an explanation of the poetic mythology of the Ancients, at once intelligible to youth, and fit for their perusal. There is nothing in this Volume to offend the delicacy of the female mind, or to suggest offensive associations. The explanations of the legends are ingenious, and as authentic as the nature of the thing admits ; and Mr. Keightley has evidently taken great pains, in order that those who derive their first mythological ideas from this book, may have nothing to *unlearn* in their future progress. The wood-cuts are taken partly from antiques, and partly from Flaxman’s classic designs.

Art. X. *Illustrations of the Vaudois, in a Series of Views: Engraved by Edward Finden, from Drawings by Hugh Dyke Acland.* Accompanied with Descriptions. Royal 8vo. Price 10s. 6d. London, 1831.

THE drawings for these prints, were originally intended to illustrate the Author’s highly interesting volume entitled “ The Glorious Recovery by the Vaudois of their Valleys ” ; published in 1827 *. Mr. Acland has ‘ obeyed the requests of many persons ’ in republishing the prints in a separate form, prefixing to them a very brief outline of the most remarkable incidents of the history. They are twelve in number, beautifully engraved, and the scenes are highly interesting and picturesque. To those persons who are in possession of Mr. Gilly’s Narrative, these Illustrations will be particularly acceptable ; and we are, for our own part, so well pleased with this elegant publication, that we cannot withhold our tribute of thanks to the Author.

* See Eclectic Review, 3d Series, Vol. I. p. 253.

ART. XI. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

We readily comply with the request to give insertion to the following statement.

‘TAHITI AND THE PITCAIRN ISLANDERS.

‘ In the *Missionary Chronicle* for the month of January last, it was stated that the Inhabitants of Pitcairn’s Island had been removed to Tahiti. Of this event an account entirely unsupported, in many respects, by actual occurrences, and calculated to excite strong prejudice against the missionaries in Tahiti, has been widely circulated by several of the public journals.

‘ The Directors of the London Missionary Society deem it quite unnecessary to reply to every anonymous calumniator, who may choose to give vent to his disappointment or ill-nature, by attempts to bring discredit on their missionaries ; but they are, at all times, solicitous to furnish such information as they possess, that may be suited to counteract any unfavourable impression which misrepresentations may have produced on the minds of the friends of the missionaries, and the supporters of the Society.

‘ In the account above referred to, it is insinuated that the Pitcairn islanders were removed through the representations of the missionaries, and contrary to their own wishes. How far such was the fact will appear, when it is remembered that almost every one, who has visited the retreat of the mutineers, has spoken of the inconvenience to which the increasing number of their descendants were exposed, from the circumscribed extent of the ground capable of cultivation, and especially from the scanty supply of water which the island afforded. On these accounts the inhabitants *themselves requested* to be conveyed to some other place, where the means of subsistence might be obtained in greater abundance. This request was made, in the first instance, to government, through the medium of a captain in his Majesty’s navy, by whom they were visited, and was acceded to before the missionaries in Tahiti were even acquainted with the desire of the Pitcairn islanders to remove.

‘ One of the senior missionaries, Mr. Nott, who was in England at the time when the subject was under the consideration of government, expressed, when solicited, his opinion, that for the benefit of the islanders, Tahiti would be preferable to New South Wales ; and, on his return, was the bearer of a letter from his Majesty’s government to Pomare, soliciting, from the king and chiefs of Tahiti, a favourable reception for the Pitcairn islanders, should they be disposed to remove to their territory.

‘ When Captain Laws, of the *Satellite*, was at Tahiti, in 1829, he received from the late Pomare, in a public assembly of chiefs and others, an assurance of protection for the Pitcairn islanders, and of an allotment of land for their support, should they remove to Tahiti.

Captain Sandiland, of *H. M. S. Comet*, having been directed to carry into effect the benevolent intentions of Government, reached Pitcairn's Island in the month of February 1831, when he found the inhabitants distressed for want of water. As soon as informed that there was an opportunity for emigrating to Tahiti, one half of them immediately declared their determination to do so, and, on the ensuing day, the remainder came to the same resolution. They embarked accordingly without delay, and reached Tahiti in the close of the month of March last. It has been already announced, that they arrived at an exceedingly critical time; the inhabitants of that island were apparently on the eve of civil war, in consequence of some differences which existed between the queen and the hereditary chiefs. But, notwithstanding these unfavourable circumstances, both parties welcomed the arrival of the strangers, and assured the commander of the *Comet* that the promise of protection and aid which had been made by the late king, Pomare, should be faithfully performed. The differences between the queen and her chiefs were, at length, amicably adjusted. On this occasion Captain Sandiland addressed to the missionaries the letter already referred to, in which he observes,—

“Gentlemen, I return you my most cordial expression of thanks for the promptitude with which you were pleased to make known my sentiments, to the queen and her chiefs, upon the existing differences, in which I had the happiness to concur with you all; and if they were received with respect, I must sincerely ascribe it much more to the intelligence and ability displayed by you at so momentous and interesting a time, than to any intrinsic merit that my proposals possessed; and it is a circumstance affording me the highest satisfaction, to observe the great estimation you are all held in by the queen and her chiefs, which could not have been obtained but by a faithful discharge of your duties, as ministers of Christ and teachers of our holy religion; and it will be peculiarly gratifying to me to make known these circumstances most fully to those authorities whom it is my duty to inform of this transaction.”

Two days after their arrival on the shores of Tahiti, the Pitcairn islanders were landed, and before the *Comet* sailed a tract of land was granted by the queen for their use; besides which, an agreement was made by the captain with a respectable settler in Tahiti to supply them with vegetables every day, and with fresh meat three times a week.

The climate of the Society Islands is certainly as salubrious as that of Pitcairn's. The queen of Tahiti gave up a large house for their accommodation; and the people, willing also to second the friendly intentions of the British government, assisted in erecting for the strangers more permanent dwellings: while the ample provision that was made for their support for six months after their arrival, shews the absurdity of the account referred to in the beginning of these remarks, in which, among other things, it is stated, that “the probable consequence (of their removal to Tahiti) will be that these unfortunate people must *all die*, if some means of restoring them to their island are not soon found.” From a statement in the *Sydney Gazette*, in the month of May last, it appears that some of them were

in negotiation with a resident in Tahiti for the purpose of establishing a pearl-fishery on Elizabeth Island, situated in the neighbourhood of that which they had left. The individual wished, for this purpose, to purchase, of one of the missionaries, a schooner which had been built to enable the missionaries to visit the islands, to which, by means of native teachers, a knowledge of the gospel has been conveyed. Mr. Williams, the owner of the vessel, was not willing to part with the ship; and this circumstance will, in some degree, account for the injurious representation which is given of the conduct of the missionaries.

'The assertion that the Pitcairn islanders "did not willingly quit their island, but at the instigation of those who went to seek them," is evidently at variance with the facts already stated. No intelligence has yet been received of their dissatisfaction; and the other parts of the account, in reference to which these remarks are offered, are, in all probability, not entitled to greater regard than those which have been already shown to be entirely without foundation.'

In the press, and speedily will be published, "The Martyrs of the Valleys, and other poems, by Samuel Stennett, Author of *Memoirs of the Rev. W. Ward, late of Serampore*," &c.

ART. XII. WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

HISTORY.

The Cabinet Annual Register, and Historical, Political, Biographical, and Miscellaneous Chronicle, for the Year 1831. Royal 18mo. 8s. in Cloth, or 10s. 6d. Morocco.

••• Strictly neutral in politics, this work aspires to present to the public, a History of the Year at once brief and Comprehensive.'

History of the Jews, in all Ages. By the Author of "History in all Ages." 12mo. 10s. 6d. half bound.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Times, a Sermon preached Dec. 18, 1831, in the Baptist Chapel, Chipping-Norton, Oxon. By William Catton. 8vo. price 6d.

Quintus Servinton, a Tale, founded upon Incidents of Real Occurrence. 3 Vols. 12mo. (Hobart Town, printed.)

POLITICS.

On Political Economy, in connexion with the Moral State and Moral Prospects of Society. By Thomas Chalmers, Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. 8vo. 12s.

Essay on the Right of the Hindoos over Ancestral Property according to the Law of Bengal. By Rajah Rammohun Roy. Second edition. With an Appendix, con-

taining Letters on the Hindoo Law of Inheritance. 8vo.

THEOLOGY.

Dissertations on the Principles and Arrangement of a Harmony of the Gospels. By the Rev. Edward Greswell, M.A., Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In Three Volumes, 8vo.

Harmonica Evangelica, sive Quatuor Evangelia Græcè pro Temporis et Rerum Serie in Partes quinque Distributa. Editit Edvardus Greswell, A.M. Coll. C. C. Apud Oxon. Socius. 1 Vol. 8vo.

A Treatise on the Authority, Ends, and Observance of the Christian Sabbath, with an Appendix, containing a Variety of Documentary Evidence respecting prevalent Abuses, and Means for their Suppression. By the Rev. Duncan Macfarlan, Minister of Renfrew. 12mo. 4s.

Illustrations of the Christian Faith, and Christian Virtues: drawn from the Bible. By M. S. Haynes. Author of "Scenes and Thoughts," &c. 12mo. 3s.

TRAVELS.

Illustrations of the Mussulmauns of India: descriptive of their Manners, Customs, Habits, and Religious Opinions. Made during a Twelve Years' Residence in their immediate Society. By Mrs. Meer Hassan Ali. 2 Vols. 8vo.